arXiv:1009.3105v2 [math-ph] 15 Apr 2011

Maxwell-Lorentz Dynamics of Rigid Charges

G. Bauer[*], D.-A. Deckert[†], D. Dürr[‡]

September 16, 2010, rev. April 19, 2011

Abstract

We establish global existence and uniqueness of the dynamics of classical electromagnetism with extended, rigid charges and fields which need not to be square integrable. We consider also a modified theory of electromagnetism where no self-fields occur. That theory and our results are crucial for approaching the as yet unsolved problem of the general existence of dynamics of Wheeler Feynman electromagnetism, which we shall address in the follow up paper.

Keywords: Maxwell-Lorentz Equations, Wheeler-Feynman Equations, Absorber Electrodynamics, Radiation Damping, Self-Interaction, Infinite Energy Solutions, Weighted Function Spaces.

Acknowledgments: The authors want to thank Martin Kolb for his valuable comments. D.-A.D. gratefully acknowledges financial support from the *BayEFG* of the *Freistaat Bayern* and the *Universiät Bayern e.V.* as well as the from the post-doc program of the DAAD.

1 Introduction

We consider the global existence of dynamics of classical electromagnetism for extended rigid charges. To put our work into proper perspective we shall introduce a number of theories ML, ML-SI, MLD, WF, and ML$_\varrho$, ML-SI$_\varrho$, and WF$_\varrho$. The former are theories for point-charges, the latter are the theories modified by smeared out charges, i.e. extended rigid charges indicated by the charge distribution ϱ. It will become clear in a moment, why it is helpful to introduce these notations.

ML stands for Maxwell-Lorentz electrodynamics - the textbook electromagnetism [Bar80, Roh94]. It is the theory of interaction between electromagnetic radiation and charged matter. The electrodynamic field is represented by an antisymmetric second-rank tensor field F on four-dimensional Minkowski space $\mathbb{M} := (\mathbb{R}^4, g)$ equipped with a metric tensor $g := \mathrm{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$.

---

[*] gernot.bauer@fh-muenster.de

[†] deckert@math.ucdavis.edu

[‡] duerr@math.lmu.de

Charged matter is described by the four-vector charge-current density j on $\mathbb{M}$. For a prescribed current j the time evolution of the electrodynamic field F is ruled by the Maxwell equations

$$\partial_\nu F^{\mu\nu}(x) = -4\pi j^\mu(x), \qquad \partial^\gamma F^{\alpha\beta}(x) + \partial^\alpha F^{\beta\gamma}(x) + \partial^\beta F^{\gamma\alpha}(x) = 0 \tag{1}$$

where we have used Einstein's summation convention for Greek indices, i.e. $x_\mu y^\mu := \sum_{\mu=0}^{3} g_{\mu\nu} x^\mu y^\nu$, and denote the partial derivative with respect to the standard unit vectors in $\mathbb{R}^4$ by ∂_μ, $0 \leq \mu \leq 3$.

In turn, for a given electromagnetic field F, the motion of N point-like particles, which are represented by world lines $z_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{M}$, $\tau \mapsto z_i^\mu(\tau)$ with labels $1 \leq i \leq N$, obey the Lorentz force law

$$m_i \ddot{z}_i^\mu(\tau) = e_i F^{\mu\nu}(z_i(\tau))\, \dot{z}_{i,\nu}(\tau). \tag{2}$$

Here $m_i \neq 0$ denotes the mass and $e_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a coupling constant (the charge) of the i-th particle. The overset dots denote differentiation with respect to the world line parametrization τ. ML is defined by the system of equations (1) and (2) coupled by

$$j^\mu(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} j_i^\mu(x), \qquad j_i^\mu(x) := e_i \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\tau\, \dot{z}_i^\mu(\tau) \delta^{(4)}(x - z_i(\tau)) \tag{3}$$

where $\delta^{(4)}$ denotes the four-dimensional Dirac delta distribution.

Unfortunately and well known, ML is merely a formal set of equations. The system has no solutions. The reason is that the self-field, the field created by a point-charge and acting back on it, is infinite at the position of the point-charge. For reasons which become clear soon we recall the nature of this singularity. Due to the linearity of the Maxwell equations we may decompose the field F into the sum of fields F_k, $1 \leq k \leq N$, fulfilling

$$\partial_\mu F_k^{\mu\nu}(x) = 4\pi j_k^\nu(x), \qquad \partial^\gamma F_k^{\alpha\beta}(x) + \partial^\alpha F_k^{\beta\gamma}(x) + \partial^\beta F_k^{\gamma\alpha}(x) = 0 \tag{4}$$

and write (2) as

$$m_i \ddot{z}_i^\mu(\tau) = e_i \sum_{k=1}^{N} F_k^{\mu\nu}(z_i(\tau))\, \dot{z}_{i,\nu}(\tau). \tag{5}$$

Again by linearity the solutions F_k can be decomposed into a special solution and an arbitrary homogeneous solution $F_{0,k}$, i.e. a solution of the homogeneous Maxwell equations (4) for $j_k = 0$:

$$F_k = F_{0,k} + \frac{1}{2}\left(F[z_k]_+ + F[z_k]_-\right). \tag{6}$$

The special solutions $F_+[z_k], F_-[z_k]$ are the well known advanced and retarded Liénard-Wiechert fields of the k-th world line [Bar80, Roh94] given by

$$F_\pm^{\mu\nu} := \partial^\mu A_\pm^\nu - \partial^\nu A_\pm^\mu, \qquad A[z_i]_\pm^\mu(x) := e \frac{\dot{z}_i^\mu(\tau^\pm)}{(x - z_i(\tau^\pm))_\nu \dot{z}_i^\nu(\tau^\pm)}, \qquad z_i^0(\tau^\pm) = x^0 \pm \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_i(\tau^\pm)\|, \tag{7}$$

where we use the notation $x = (x^0, \mathbf{x})$ for $x \in \mathbb{M}$. The square brackets emphasize that these fields are functionals of the world line z_k; note that τ^+, τ^- in (7) are implicitly defined. Now (7) shows that the $F[z_k]_+(x), F[z_k]_-(x)$ become infinite at $x \in \{z_k(\tau) \mid \tau \in \mathbb{R}\}$. But it is exactly there where the $i = k$ summand in the Lorentz force (5) needs to be evaluated. This divergence persists also in quantum field theories where it is referred to as *UV divergence*.

The simplest modification which avoids singular fields is ML_ϱ, suggested by Abraham and Lorentz. It is ML but with the point-charges replaced by extended charges; cf. (14),(15). However, a rigid extension of the charge is for physical reasons unwanted [Fre25], and furthermore (even if correctly Lorentz-boosted) in violation with relativity [Nod64, Spo04].

The most familiar attempt to achieve a relativistic point-charge electromagnetism without singularities is the mass renormalization program of Dirac [Dir38]. In essence it is a point-charge limit procedure of ML_ϱ. Dirac replaces the Lorentz equations (in a more or less ad hoc manner) by

$$m_{i,\mathrm{exp}}\ddot{z}_i^\mu(\tau) = e_i \left[\sum_{k \neq i} \left(F_{0,k} + F[z_k]_- \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(F[z_i]_- - F[z_i]_+ \right) \right]^{\mu\nu} (z_i(\tau))\, \dot{z}_{i,\nu}(\tau). \tag{8}$$

These equations ($1 \leq i \leq N$) are called the Lorentz-Dirac equations (LD). Note that the mass appearing on the left-hand side is the so called experimental mass $m_{i,\mathrm{exp}}$ (see below). According to LD the i-th particle feels a Lorentz force due to an autonomous free field $F_{0,k}$ and due to the retarded fields $F[z_k]_-$ of all other charges. Furthermore, it feels the force term $\frac{1}{2}\left(F[z_i]_- - F[z_i]_+\right)$ which was interpreted by Dirac as the radiation field produced by the charge itself and is to be held responsible for radiation damping. He computed its principal value:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(F[z_i]_-^{\mu\nu} - F[z_i]_+^{\mu\nu} \right) (z_i(\tau)) = \frac{2}{3} e_i^2 \left(\dddot{z}_i^\mu(\tau) \dot{z}_i^\nu(\tau) - \dddot{z}_i^\nu(\tau) \dot{z}_i^\mu(\tau) \right). \tag{9}$$

The third derivative is supposed to describe friction, hence the name *radiation damping* equation. Dirac's limit procedure can be reinterpreted as a renormalization procedure in which the so called bare masses m_i approach $-\infty$, thereby subtracting the singular behavior of the fields $\frac{1}{2}\left(F_{i,-} + F_{i,+}\right)$ when the charge extension goes to zero as well as yielding the observed experimental mass $m_{i,\mathrm{exp}}$. In this respect it may be worth noting that in [BD01] it was observed that a negative bare mass m_i causes the dynamics of ML_ϱ to become unstable. In any case it is well known that LD has unphysical solutions. Already for $N = 1$ and zero homogeneous fields all solutions except $\ddot{z}_i = 0$ show run-away behavior, i.e. they approach the speed of light exponentially fast. For a detailed analysis of the LD equation see [Spo04]. MLD is the theory defined by the Maxwell equations (4) coupled to (8) via (3).

The main aim of our research, of which we present results in this and the follow up paper [BDD10], is in fact the description of electromagnetic phenomena without self-field divergences. That is why we focus on another formulation of electrodynamics without self-fields which is suggested by the Wheeler-Feynman electromagnetism [WF45] and discussed in [Dec10]. The basic idea is that fields are only mediators of interaction *between* charges. We consider the Maxwell equations (4) but we replace the Lorentz force law by

$$m_i \ddot{z}_i^\mu(\tau) = e_i \sum_{k \neq i} F_k^{\mu\nu}(z_i(\tau))\, \dot{z}_{i,\nu}(\tau). \tag{10}$$

Note that in contrast to (5) the self-field summand $k = i$ is excluded. We refer to this theory as ML-SI (Maxwell-Lorentz without Self Interaction). To connect this theory with MLD we appeal to the observation done by Wheeler and Feynman, namely that to any solution of ML-SI satisfying the extra constraint

$$\text{AC:} \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(F[z_i]_- - F[z_i]_+\right)(x) = 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{M}, \tag{11}$$

belong world lines of the charges which satisfy the LD equation. One sees this by trivial manipulations of terms. Based on Dirac's interpretation of the term $\frac{1}{2}(F[z_i]_- - F[z_i]_+)$ as the field radiated by the i-th charge, (11) states that the net radiation field is completely absorbed from which the name *complete absorption condition* (AC) is derived. Wheeler and Feynman think of this condition as being satisfied for a thermal equilibrium distribution of a large number of charges and discuss it thoroughly in [WF49, WF45]. Stretching notations somewhat we may rephrase the above in a formal way by

$$\text{ML-SI } \cap \text{AC} = \text{MLD} \cap \text{AC},$$

where we understand the symbols now as sets of solutions: ML-SI $\cap$ AC (resp. MLD $\cap$ AC) is the set of solutions of ML-SI (resp. MLD) which fulfill AC.

An important feature of ML-SI is that it is very close to WF, the Wheeler-Feynman electromagnetism: WF contains no fields at all, only charges and is defined by

$$m_i \ddot{z}_i^{\mu}(\tau) = e_i \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{2} \left(F[z_k]_+ + F[z_k]_-\right)^{\mu\nu} (z_i(\tau))\, \dot{z}_{i,\nu}(\tau) \tag{12}$$

where $F[z_k]_+$ and $F[z_k]_-$ are given by (7). Due to the implicit definition of τ^+, τ^- in (7) these equations involve advanced and retarded arguments and they belong mathematically to the class of neutral differential equations with unbounded delay. The connection between WF and ML-SI becomes manifest when we consider the case for which the homogeneous fields vanish: $F_{0,k} \equiv 0, 1 \leq k \leq N$. Let us refer to this restricted theory as ML-SI$\backslash\{F_0 \equiv 0\}$. In view of (6) and (10) the world lines appearing in the solutions of ML-SI$\backslash\{F_0 \equiv 0\}$ are WF world lines, i.e. they fulfill (12). In short:

$$\text{WF} = \{\text{world lines of ML-SI} \setminus \{F_0 \equiv 0\}\}. \tag{13}$$

It is important that the reader appreciates the difference between ML-SI and WF. There is no solution theory of WF, since the equations contain time-like advanced and retarded arguments. The problem of existence of dynamics of WF is in fact famously difficult, since it is unclear how to even start a theory of solutions. On the other hand, ML-SI is mathematically an initial value problem and at least the notion of local existence and uniqueness of solutions is clear. Now it seems that with (13) all is clear, because WF is simply ML-SI with the homogeneous fields being zero. But there is a catch: One has no idea for which *initial* fields it is the case that the homogeneous field fulfills $\sum_{k=1}^{N} F_{0,k} \equiv 0$, or equivalently $F_k \equiv \frac{1}{2}(F[z_k]_+ + F[z_k]_-)$. In other words we do not know the initial conditions which define ML-SI/($\mathrm{F}_0 \equiv 0$).

Nevertheless (13) allows us to get a handle on the question of existence of solutions of WF which we present in the follow up paper [BDD10]. However, to be able to apply (13) to the WF problem we must be sure that the Liénard-Wiechert fields (7) generated by WF world lines are within the class of fields of ML-SI/($\mathrm{F}_0 \equiv 0$). Now some solutions of WF are known, namely the so called Schild solutions [Sch63] which describe charges rotating around each other on stable orbits. Such world lines with non-vanishing acceleration for large times generate Liénard-Wiechert fields (7) that are in general not square integrable. We must therefore prove a general existence of dynamics result for ML-SI where we allow fields which are not square integrable.

Now that we have explained the role of the theory ML-SI, which under the condition AC (cf. (11)) describes the observed radiation phenomena, we must step back. ML-SI avoids the singular self-fields which make the dynamics ill-defined from the start. But that does not mean that ML-SI allows the existence of *global* solutions for *all* initial conditions. In fact, to establish existence of global solutions some notion of *typical* initial conditions must be invoked, since ML-SI (for opposite charges) is very analogous to masses interacting via gravitation, hence scenarios like explosions may be possible; see for example [SMSM71]. However, such considerations are at this early stage of research not in our focus and, for simplicity, we consider ML-SI$_\varrho$, and WF$_\varrho$. i.e. the theories with extended charges where singularities do not even occur when charges pass through each other.

We establish here the global existence and uniqueness of ML-SI$_\varrho$ and by the same token that of ML$_\varrho$. The charge density ϱ we consider is rigid. Global existence and uniqueness of solutions of ML$_\varrho$ for one particle and square integrable initial fields, has been settled by two different techniques: While in [KS00] one exploits the energy conservation to gain an priori bound needed for global existence, a Grönwall argument was used in [BD01]. Recent results are on the long-time behavior of solutions in [KS00] and [IKS02] and on conservation laws in [Kie04]. Furthermore, a generalization to a spinning, extended charge was treated in [AK01].

2 Our Results

For the mathematical analysis it is convenient to express ML-SI$_\varrho$ and ML$_\varrho$ in non-relativistic notation using coordinates. The electric and magnetic field of each charge are defined by $\mathbf{E}_{i,t} := (F^{0i}(t,\cdot))_{1\le i\le 3}$, $\mathbf{B}_{i,t} := (F_i^{23}(t,\cdot), F_i^{31}(t,\cdot), F_i^{12}(t,\cdot))$, respectively. The defining equations are

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{E}_{i,t} &= \nabla \wedge \mathbf{B}_{i,t} - 4\pi \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_{i,t})\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_{i,t}) & \qquad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{E}_{i,t} &= 4\pi\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_{t,i}) \\ \partial_t \mathbf{B}_{i,t} &= -\nabla \wedge \mathbf{E}_{i,t} & \qquad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}_{i,t} &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

together with

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \mathbf{q}_{i,t} &= \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_{i,t}) := \frac{\sigma_i \mathbf{p}_{i,t}}{\sqrt{m_i^2 + \mathbf{p}_{i,t}^2}} \\ \partial_t \mathbf{p}_{i,t} &= \sum_{j=1}^{N} e_{ij} \int d^3x \, \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_{i,t}) \left[\mathbf{E}_{j,t}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{v}_{i,t} \wedge \mathbf{B}_{j,t}(\mathbf{x}) \right] \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

for $1 \le i \le N$. The equations in the right-hand column of (14) are also called the *Maxwell constraints*. We denote the partial derivative with respect to time t by ∂_t, the divergence by $\nabla\cdot$ and the curl by $\nabla\wedge$. Vectors in $\mathbb{R}^3$ are written as bold letters, e.g. $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. At time t the i-th charge is situated at position $\mathbf{q}_{i,t}$ in euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^3$ and has momentum $\mathbf{p}_{i,t} \in \mathbb{R}^3$. It carries the classical mass $m_i \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. The geometry of the i-th rigid charge is given in terms of a charge distribution (or form factor) $\varrho_i : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ which is assumed to be an infinitely often differentiable function with compact support, denoted by $\varrho_i \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R})$. The factors $\sigma_i := \operatorname{sign}(m_i)$ denote the sign of the masses (negative masses are useful to analyze dynamical instability when taking the point-particle limit to MLD). Each charge is associated with an own electric and magnetic field $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{i,t}$, which are $\mathbb{R}^3$ valued functions on $\mathbb{R}^3$. Whereas in the classical literature one usually considers only one electric and magnetic field, we have given every charge its own field to allow exclusion of self-fields: The matrix coefficients $e_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq N$ allow to switch on or off the coupling of the j-th field to the i-th particle. This yields

$$\text{ML}_\varrho \quad \text{for} \qquad e_{ij} = 1, \qquad 1 \leq i, j \leq N. \tag{16}$$

and

$$\text{ML-SI}_\varrho \quad \text{for} \qquad e_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i \neq j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \qquad 1 \leq i, j \leq N. \tag{17}$$

For $\varrho_i = \delta^{(3)}$ the corresponding system of equations formally define ML and ML-SI, respectively.

The existence and uniqueness theory build in the following will neither depend on a particular choice of the coupling matrix e_{ij}, nor on the masses m_i, nor on a particular choice of the charge distributions $\varrho_i \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R})$. For notational simplicity we shall now denote - in slight abuse of notation - the theory for any choices of the coupling matrix e_{ij} simply by ML_ϱ.

We intend to arrive at a well-posed initial value problem for given positions and momenta $\mathbf{p}_i^0, \mathbf{q}_i^0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ as well as electric and magnetic fields $\mathbf{E}_i^0, \mathbf{B}_i^0 : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ at time $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ for which we define the function space for the fields. As we remarked in the introduction we wish to incorporate Liénard-Wiechert fields produced by any time-like charge trajectory with uniformly bounded acceleration and momentum as Cauchy data (e.g. consider the bounded orbits of the Schild solutions [Sch63]). We shall show in the follow up paper [BDD10] that such fields decay as $O(\|\mathbf{x}\|^{-1})$ for $\|\mathbf{x}\| \to \infty$. Hence, in general these fields are not in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ and that is why we establish the initial value problem for a bigger class of fields:

Definition 2.1 (Weighted Square Integrable Functions). *We define the class of weight functions*

$$\mathcal{W} := \left\{ w \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{0\}) \,\middle|\, \exists\, C_w \in \mathbb{R}^+, P_w \in \mathbb{N} : w(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) \leq (1 + C_w \|\mathbf{y}\|)^{P_w} w(\mathbf{x}) \right\}. \tag{18}$$

For any $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and open $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ we define the space of weighted square integrable functions $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3$ by

$$L^2_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}) := \left\{ \mathbf{F} : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3 \text{ measurable} \,\middle|\, \int d^3x \; w(\mathbf{x}) \|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})\|^2 < \infty \right\}.$$

For regularity arguments we need more conditions on the weight functions. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$\mathcal{W}^k := \left\{ w \in \mathcal{W} \,\middle|\, \exists\, C_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ : |D^\alpha \sqrt{w}| \leq C_\alpha \sqrt{w}, |\alpha| \leq k \right\} \tag{19}$$

and

$$\mathcal{W}^\infty := \{ w \in \mathcal{W} \mid w \in \mathcal{W}^k \; \forall\, k \in \mathbb{N} \}.$$

The choice of $\mathcal{W}$ is quite natural (compare [HÖ5]) as for most estimates it allows to treat the new measure $w(\mathbf{x})d^3x$ almost as if it were translational invariant. Clearly, $w = 1$ is in $\mathcal{W}$. Applying its definition twice we obtain for all $w \in \mathcal{W}$ the estimate

$$(1 + C_w\|\mathbf{y}\|)^{-P_w} w(\mathbf{x}) \leq w(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) \leq (1 + C_w\|\mathbf{y}\|)^{P_w} w(\mathbf{x}) \tag{20}$$

which states that $w \in \mathcal{W} \Leftrightarrow w^{-1} \in \mathcal{W}$. In particular, the weight $w(\mathbf{x}) = (1 + \|\mathbf{x}\|^2)^{-1}$ is in $\mathcal{W}$ because

$$w^{-1}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) := 1 + \|\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}\|^2 \leq 1 + (\|\mathbf{x}\| + \|\mathbf{y}\|)^2 \leq (1 + \|\mathbf{x}\|^2)(1 + \|\mathbf{y}\|)^2, \tag{21}$$

and therefore the desired Liénard-Wiechert fields are in $L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ for $w(\mathbf{x}) := (1 + \|\mathbf{x}\|^2)^{-1}$. In the follow up paper [BDD10] it is shown that $w \in \mathcal{W}^\infty$. With this we can define the space of initial values:

Definition 2.2 (Phase Space)**.** *We define*

$$\mathcal{H}_w := \oplus_{i=1}^N \left(\mathbb{R}^3 \oplus \mathbb{R}^3 \oplus L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3) \oplus L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)\right).$$

Any element $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_w$ consists of the components $\varphi = (\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)_{1\leq i\leq N}$, i.e. positions $\mathbf{q}_i$, momenta $\mathbf{p}_i$ and electric and magnetic fields $\mathbf{E}_i$ and $\mathbf{B}_i$ for each of the $1 \leq i \leq N$ charges.

If not noted otherwise, any spatial derivative will be understood in the distribution sense, and the Latin indices $i, j, \ldots$ run over the charge labels $1, 2, \ldots, N$. We also need the weighted Sobolev spaces

$$\begin{aligned} H^{curl}_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3) &:= \{\mathbf{F} \in L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3) \mid \nabla \wedge \mathbf{F} \in L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)\}, \\ H^k_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3) &:= \{\mathbf{F} \in L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3) \mid D^\alpha\mathbf{F} \in L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3) \ \forall\, |\alpha| \leq k\} \end{aligned}$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We will rewrite ML_ϱ using the following operators A and J:

Definition 2.3 (Operator A)**.** *For a $\varphi = (\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)_{1\leq i\leq N}$ we defined $\mathtt{A}$ and A by the expression*

$$A\varphi = \left(0, 0, \mathtt{A}(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)\right)_{1\leq i\leq N} := \left(0, 0, -\nabla \wedge \mathbf{E}_i, \nabla \wedge \mathbf{B}_i\right)_{1\leq i\leq N}.$$

on their natural domain

$$D_w(A) := \oplus_{i=1}^N \left(\mathbb{R}^3 \oplus \mathbb{R}^3 \oplus H^{curl}_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3) \oplus H^{curl}_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)\right) \subset \mathcal{H}_w.$$

Furthermore, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define

$$D_w(A^n) := \{\varphi \in D_w(A) \mid A^k\varphi \in D_w(A),\ 0 \leq k \leq n - 1\}, \qquad D_w(A^\infty) := \cap_{n=0}^\infty D_w(A^n).$$

Definition 2.4 (Operator J)**.** *Together with $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) := \frac{\sigma_i\mathbf{p}_i}{\sqrt{\mathbf{p}_i^2+m_i^2}}$ we define $J : \mathcal{H}_w \to D_w(A^\infty)$ by*

$$\varphi \mapsto J(\varphi) := \left(\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i), \sum_{j=1}^N e_{ij} \int d^3x\, \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i) \left(\mathbf{E}_j(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) \wedge \mathbf{B}_j(\mathbf{x})\right), -4\pi\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i), 0\right)_{1\leq i\leq N}$$

for $\varphi = (\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)_{1\leq i\leq N}$.

Note that J is well-defined because $\varrho_i \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R})$. With these definitions, the Lorentz force law (15), the Maxwell equations (14), while temporarily neglecting the Maxwell constraints, take the form

$$\dot{\varphi}_t = A\varphi_t + J(\varphi_t). \tag{22}$$

In the following we frequently use the notation $C \in \mathtt{Bounds}$ to denote that C is a continuous mapping depending non-decreasingly on all of its arguments. The two main theorems are:

Theorem 2.5 (Global Existence and Uniqueness)**.** *For $w \in \mathcal{W}^1$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varphi^0 \in D_w(A^n)$ the following holds:*

(i) (global existence) *There exists an n-times continuously differentiable mapping*

$$\varphi_{(\cdot)} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{H}_w, \qquad\qquad t \mapsto \varphi_t = (\mathbf{q}_{i,t}, \mathbf{p}_{i,t}, \mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t})_{1\le i\le N}$$

which solves (22) for initial value $\varphi_t|_{t=0} = \varphi^0$. Furthermore, it holds $\frac{d^j}{dt^j}\varphi_t \in D_w(A^{n-j})$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 \le j \le n$,

(ii) (uniqueness and growth) *If any once continuously differentiable function $\widetilde{\varphi} : \Lambda \to D_w(A)$ for some open interval $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is also a solution to (22) with $\widetilde{\varphi}_{t^*} = \varphi_{t^*}$ for some $t^* \in \Lambda$, then $\varphi_t = \widetilde{\varphi}_t$ holds for all $t \in \Lambda$. In particular, given ϱ_i, $1 \le i \le N$, there exists $C_1 \in \mathtt{Bounds}$ such that for all $T > 0$ such that $(-T, T) \subseteq \Lambda$*

$$\sup_{t\in[-T,T]} \|\varphi_t - \widetilde{\varphi}_t\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \le C_1(T, \|\varphi_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})\|\varphi_{t_0} - \widetilde{\varphi}_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \tag{23}$$

holds. Furthermore, there is a $C_2 \in \mathtt{Bounds}$ such that for all ϱ_i, $1 \le i \le N$, and $T > 0$ with $(-T, T) \subseteq \Lambda$ one has

$$\sup_{t\in[-T,T]} \|\varphi_t\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \le C_2\left(T, \|w^{-1/2}\varrho_i\|_{L^2}, \|\varrho_i\|_{L^2_w}; 1 \le i \le N\right) \|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}. \tag{24}$$

(iii) (constraints) *If the solution $t \mapsto \varphi_t = (\mathbf{q}_{i,t}, \mathbf{p}_{i,t}, \mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t})_{1\le i\le N}$ obeys the Maxwell constraints*

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E}_{i,t} = 4\pi\varrho(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_{i,t}), \qquad\qquad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}_{i,t} = 0 \tag{25}$$

for one time instant $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then they are obeyed for all times $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 2.6 (Regularity)**.** *Let $w \in \mathcal{W}^2$, $n = 2m$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $t \mapsto \varphi_t = (\mathbf{q}_{i,t}, \mathbf{p}_{i,t}, \mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t})_{1\le i\le N}$ be the solution to (22) for initial value $\varphi_t|_{t=0} = \varphi^0 \in D_w(A^n)$. Then for all $1 \le i \le N$:*

(i) It holds for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ that $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t} \in H_w^{\triangle^m}$.

(ii) The electromagnetic fields regarded as mappings $\mathbf{E}_i : (t, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbf{E}_{i,t}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{B}_i : (t, \mathbf{x}) \mapsto \mathbf{B}_{i,t}(\mathbf{x})$ are in $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^3)$ and both have a representative in $C^{n-2}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^3)$ within their equivalence class.

(iii) For $w \in \mathcal{W}^k$, $k \ge 2$, and every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we have also $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t} \in H_w^n$ and $C < \infty$ such that:

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{|\alpha|\le k} \|D^\alpha \mathbf{E}_{i,t}(\mathbf{x})\| \le C\|\mathbf{E}_{i,t}\|_{H_w^k} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \sup_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{|\alpha|\le k} \|D^\alpha \mathbf{B}_{i,t}(\mathbf{x})\| \le C\|\mathbf{B}_{i,t}\|_{H_w^k}. \tag{26}$$

The proofs will be given in sections 2.2 and 2.3 where we rely on tools for the study of $L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ and the associated weighted Sobolev spaces discussed in Section 2.1 as well as on the abstract global existence and uniqueness theorem discussed in the appendix A. In the formulas we use "…" to denote the right-hand side of the preceding equation or inequality.

Theorem 2.5 permits us to define a time evolution operator:

Definition 2.7 (Maxwell-Lorentz Time Evolution)**.** *We define the non-linear operator*

$$M_L : \mathbb{R}^2 \times D_w(A) \to D_w(A), \qquad (t, t_0, \varphi^0) \mapsto M_L(t, t_0)[\varphi^0] = \varphi_t = W_{t-t_0}\varphi^0 + \int_{t_0}^{t} W_{t-s} J(\varphi_s)$$

which encodes ML_ϱ time evolution from time t_0 to time t.

2.1 The Spaces of Weighted Square Integrable Functions

We now collect all needed properties of the introduced weighted function spaces. The following assertions, except Theorem 2.17, are independent of the space dimension. That is why we often use the abbreviation $L^2_w = L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ and $C^\infty_c = C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$. With $w \in \mathcal{W}$ the L^2_w analogues of almost all results of the L^2 theory which do not involve the Fourier transform can be proven with only minor modifications. For open $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$, $L^2_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)$ is clearly a linear space and has an inner product:

$$\langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \rangle_{L^2_w} := \int_\Omega d^3x \; w(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}), \qquad \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \in L^2_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3). \tag{27}$$

As a standard result since $(\Omega, \sqrt{w} d^3x)$ for $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ is a σ-finite measure space:

Theorem 2.8 (Properties of L^2_w)**.** *For any $w \in \mathcal{W}$, open $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$, $L^2_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)$ with inner product (27) is a separable Hilbert space and $C^\infty_c(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3)$ lies dense.*

We shall sometimes switch between the L^2_w and the L^2 notation, i.e. in the case of the Schwarz inequality for all $\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \in L^2_w$ we write $|\langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \rangle_{L^2_w}| = \left| \left\langle \sqrt{w}\mathbf{f}, \sqrt{w}\mathbf{g} \right\rangle_{L^2} \right| \leq \| \sqrt{w}\mathbf{f} \|_{L^2} \| \sqrt{w}\mathbf{g} \|_{L^2} = \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2_w} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2_w}$. We shall also need:

Definition 2.9 (Weighted Sobolev Spaces)**.** *For all $w \in \mathcal{W}$, open $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^3$ and $k \geq 0$ we define*

$$\begin{aligned} H^k_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) &:= \left\{ \mathbf{f} \in L^2_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) \;\middle|\; D^\alpha \mathbf{f} \in L^2_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3), |\alpha| \leq k \right\}, \\ H^{\triangle^k}_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) &:= \left\{ \mathbf{f} \in L^2_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) \;\middle|\; \triangle^j \mathbf{f} \in L^2_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) \textit{ for } 0 \leq j \leq k \right\}, \\ H^{curl}_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) &:= \left\{ \mathbf{f} \in L^2_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) \;\middle|\; \nabla \wedge \mathbf{f} \in L^2_w(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^3) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

which are equipped with the inner products

$$\langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \rangle_{H^k_w} := \sum_{|\alpha| \leq k} \langle D^\alpha \mathbf{f}, D^\alpha \mathbf{g} \rangle_{L^2_w(\Omega)}, \qquad \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \rangle_{H^\triangle_w(\Omega)} := \sum_{j=0}^{k} \left\langle \triangle^j \mathbf{f}, \triangle^j \mathbf{g} \right\rangle_{L^2_w(\Omega)}$$

$$\langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \rangle_{H^{curl}_w(\Omega)} := \langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \rangle_{L^2_w(\Omega)} + \langle \nabla \wedge \mathbf{f}, \nabla \wedge \mathbf{g} \rangle_{L^2_w(\Omega)} ,$$

respectively. We use the multi-index notation $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^3$, $|\alpha| := \sum_{i=1}^{3} \alpha_i$, $D^\alpha = \partial_1^{\alpha_1} \partial_2^{\alpha_2} \partial_3^{\alpha_3}$ *where* ∂_i *denotes the derivative w.r.t. to the i-th standard unit vector in* $\mathbb{R}^3$*. In the following we use a superscript #, e.g.* $H^\#_w$*, as a placeholder for* k, $\triangle^k$*, and curl for any* $k \in \mathbb{N}$*, respectively. We shall also need the local versions, i.e.* $H^\#_{loc} := \{\mathbf{f} \in L^2_{loc} \mid \mathbf{f} \in H^\#(K),$ *for every open* $K \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^3\}$*, where* $\subset\subset$ *is short for compactly contained. Usually we abbreviate* $H^k_w = H^k_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$*, use* $L^2_w = H^0_w$ *and drop the subscript* w *if* $w = 1$*.*

By definition of the weak derivative, Theorem 2.8 implies also:

Theorem 2.10 (Weighted Sobolev Spaces)**.** *For any* $w \in \mathcal{W}$*,* $H^\#_w$ *is a separable Hilbert space.*

Lemma 2.11 (Relation between $H^\#_w$ and $H^\#_{loc}$)**.** *Let* $w \in \mathcal{W}$*. For an open* $O \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^3$ *one has* $H^\#_w(O) = H^\#(O)$ *and the respective norms are equivalent. Hence, a function* $\mathbf{f}$ *is in* $H^\#_w(K)$ *for every open* $K \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^3$ *if and only if* $\mathbf{f} \in H^\#_{loc}$*.*

Proof. Given $w \in \mathcal{W}$, equation (20) ensures that there are two finite and non-zero constants $0 < C_3 := \inf_{\mathbf{x}\in O} w(\mathbf{x})$, $C_4 := \sup_{\mathbf{x}\in O} w(\mathbf{x}) < \infty$. Thus, we get $C_3 \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H^\#(O)} \le \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H^\#_w(O)} \le C_4 \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H^\#(O)}$. □

A direct computations using Definition (19) gives:

Lemma 2.12 (Properties of Weights in $\mathcal{W}^k$)**.** *Let* $w \in \mathcal{W}^k$*, then for every multi-index* $|\alpha| \le k$ *there also exists constants* $0 \le C^\alpha < \infty$ *such that on* $\mathbb{R}^3$

$$|D^\alpha w| \le C^\alpha w, \qquad \qquad \left| D^\alpha w^{-1/2} \right| \le C^\alpha w^{-1/2}.$$

Theorem 2.13 (C^∞_c dense in $H^\#_w$)**.** *In the case # = k and # = curl let* $w \in \mathcal{W}$*. In the case* $\# = \triangle^k$ *let* $w \in \mathcal{W}^2$*. Then* C^∞_c *is a dense subset of* $H^\#_w$*.*

Proof. The proof is similar in all cases. Only the case $H^{\triangle^k}_w$ is a bit more involved as one e.g. needs to estimate the derivatives $\partial_i \partial_j$, $1 \le i, j \le 3$, in terms of the Laplacian. Let $\mathbf{f} \in H^{\triangle^k}_w$, then we need to show that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $\mathbf{g} \in C^\infty_c$ such that $\|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{g}\|_{H^{\triangle^k}_w} < \epsilon$. Take a $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^3, [0, 1])$ such that $\varphi(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ for $\|\mathbf{x}\| \le 1$. For $\varphi_n(\mathbf{x}) := \varphi\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}}{n}\right)$ the sequence $(\mathbf{f}\varphi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\mathbf{f}$ in L^2_w by definition. Furthermore, we have

$$\|\triangle \mathbf{f} - \triangle(\mathbf{f}\ \varphi_n)\|^2_{L^2_w} \le \|\triangle \mathbf{f} - \varphi_n\ \triangle \mathbf{f}\|_{L^2_w} + \frac{1}{n^2} \|\triangle \varphi_n\ \mathbf{f}\|_{L^2_w} + \frac{2}{n} \|\nabla \varphi_n \cdot \nabla \mathbf{f}\|_{L^2_w} . \tag{28}$$

Again by definition of φ_n the first term on the right-hand side of (28) goes to zero for $n \to \infty$. With $C_5 := \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}, \mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^3} \sum_{|\alpha|\le 3} \left| D^\alpha \varphi\left(\frac{\mathbf{x}}{n}\right) \right| < \infty$ we have $\|\triangle \varphi_n\ \mathbf{f}\|_{L^2_w} \le C_5 \|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^2_w}$ so that also the second term goes to zero for $n \to \infty$. Furthermore, on open sets $K \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^3$ we have $H^\triangle_w(K, \mathbb{R}^3) = H^\triangle(K, \mathbb{R}^3)$ by Lemma 2.11 and therefore $\mathbf{f} \in H^\triangle_{loc}$. Thus, we can apply partial integration and, using the abbreviation $\omega_n = w \sum_{i=1}^{3} (\partial_i \varphi_n)^2$, yield

$$\|\nabla \varphi_n \cdot \nabla \mathbf{f}\|^2_{L^2_w} \le \sum_{i=1}^{3} \int d^3x\ \omega_n(\mathbf{x}) (\partial_i \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))^2 \le \left| \sum_{i=1}^{3} \int d^3x\ \left[\partial_i \omega_n\ \mathbf{f}\ \partial_i \mathbf{f} + \omega_n\ \partial_i^2 \mathbf{f}\ \mathbf{f} \right] (\mathbf{x}) \right| .$$

In the first terms on the right-hand side we apply the chain rule $\mathbf{f}\ \partial_i \mathbf{f} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_i \mathbf{f}^2$ and integrate by parts again so that

$$\ldots = \left| \sum_{i=1}^{3} \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2} \partial_i^2 \omega_n\ \mathbf{f}^2 + \omega_n\ \partial_i^2 \mathbf{f}\ \mathbf{f} \right](\mathbf{x}) \right| \le \frac{1}{2} \left\| \sqrt{|\triangle \omega_n|}\ \mathbf{f} \right\|_{L^2}^2 + \left| \left\langle \sqrt{|\omega_n|}\ \triangle \mathbf{f},\ \sqrt{|\omega_n|}\ \mathbf{f} \right\rangle_{L^2} \right|$$

By Lemma 2.12 we have $|D^\alpha w| \le C^\alpha w$ on $\mathbb{R}^3$. Define $C_6 := \sum_{|\alpha| \le 2} C^\alpha$, then $|\triangle \omega_n| \le 9 {C_5}^2 C_6 w$ and $|\omega_n| \le 3 {C_5}^2 w$ uniformly in n on $\mathbb{R}^3$. Finally, using Schwarz's inequality we get

$$\|\nabla \varphi_n \cdot \nabla \mathbf{f}\|_{L_w^2}^2 \le {C_5}^2 \left(\frac{9}{2} C_6 + 3 \right) \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^\triangle}^2 .$$

Going back to equation (28) we then find that also the last term on the right-hand side goes to zero as $n \to \infty$. It is straight-forward to apply this idea to also show $\|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}\varphi_n\|_{H_w^{\triangle^k}} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for $k > 1$ (note that also for $k > 1$ the condition $w \in \mathcal{W}^2$ is sufficient). Hence, we conclude that there is an $\mathbf{h} \in H_w^{\triangle^k}$ with compact support and $\|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{h}\|_{H_w^{\triangle^k}} \le \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. Now let $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R})$ and define $\psi_n(\mathbf{x}) := n^3 \psi(n\mathbf{x})$. It is a standard analysis argument that $\|\mathbf{h} - \mathbf{h} * \psi_n\|_{H^{\triangle^k}} \to 0$ for $n \to \infty$. Thus, due to Lemma 2.11 for n large enough $\|\mathbf{h} - \mathbf{h} * \psi_n\|_{H_w^{\triangle^k}} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ because, as $\mathbf{h}$ and ψ_n have compact support, $\mathbf{g} := \mathbf{h} * \psi_n \in C_c^\infty$. With that $\|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{g}\|_{H_w^{\triangle^k}} \le \|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{h}\|_{H_w^{\triangle^k}} + \|\mathbf{h} - \mathbf{h} * \psi_n\|_{H_w^{\triangle^k}} < \epsilon$. Hence, C_c^∞ is dense in $H_w^{\triangle^k}$. □

REMARK 2.14. *By the standard approximation argument this theorem allows us to make use of partial integration in the spaces $H_w^\#$.*

Theorem 2.15 ($H_w^{\triangle^k}$ equals H_w^{2k})**.** *Let $w \in \mathcal{W}^2$, then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $H_w^{\triangle^k} = H_w^{2k}$ and the respective norms are equivalent.*

Proof. First we prove $H_w^\triangle = H_w^2$ and that their respective norms are equivalent. By definition of the weak derivative and Theorem 2.13 it is sufficient to show that the norms $\|\cdot\|_{H_w^\triangle}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{H_w^2}$ are equivalent on C_c^∞. By definition for $\mathbf{g} \in C_c^\infty$ we have

$$\|\mathbf{g}\|_{H_w^\triangle}^2 \le \|\mathbf{g}\|_{H_w^2}^2 = \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L_w^2}^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \|\partial_i \mathbf{g}\|_{L_w^2}^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \|\partial_i \partial_j \mathbf{g}\|_{L_w^2}^2 .$$

Using partial integration in a similar way as in the proof of Theorem 2.13 one yields the bounds

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3} \|\partial_i \mathbf{g}\|_{L_w^2}^2 \le C_6 \|\mathbf{g}\|_{H_w^\triangle}^2, \qquad \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \|\partial_i \partial_j \mathbf{g}\|_{L_w^2}^2 \le 8 C_6 \|\mathbf{g}\|_{H_w^\triangle}^2 .$$

Thus, the claim is proven for $k = 1$. Clearly, $\mathbf{f} \in H_w^{2k}$ implies $\|\mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^{\triangle^k}} \le \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^{2k}}$. On the other hand, let us assume that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\mathbf{f} \in H_w^{\triangle^k}$ also $\|\mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^{2k}} \le C_7(k) \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^{\triangle^k}}$ holds. Let $\mathbf{f} \in H_w^{\triangle^{k+1}}$ then using the induction hypothesis

$$\|\mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^{2k+2}}^2 = \sum_{|\alpha| \le 2} \|D^\alpha \mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^{2k}}^2 \le C_7 \sum_{|\alpha| \le 2} \|D^\alpha \mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^{\triangle^k}}^2 = C_7 \sum_{l=0}^{k} \sum_{|\alpha| \le 2} \|D^\alpha \triangle^l \mathbf{f}\|_{L_w^2}^2 .$$

Now $\triangle^l \mathbf{f}$ is in H_w^2 for $0 \le l \le k$ which by $H_w^\triangle = H_w^2$ and the equivalence of their respective norms implies $\|\mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^{2k+2}} \le C_8 \|\mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^{\triangle^{k+1}}}$. We conclude $H_w^{\triangle^k} = H_w^{2k}$ and their respective norms are equivalent. □

Lemma 2.16 ($H_w^\#$ equals $\sqrt{w}H^\#$)**.** *For* $\# = k$, $\# = \triangle^k$, *and* $\# = curl$, *set* $n = k$, $n = 2k$ *and* $n = 1$, *respectively. Let* $w \in \mathcal{W}^n$, *then* $H_w^\# = \sqrt{w}H^\#$ *and the respective norms are equivalent.*

Proof. Due to Theorem 2.15 we only need to show the cases $\# = curl$ and $\# = k$. We only show the latter, the former can be derived similarly. Let $\mathbf{f} \in H_w^k$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\sqrt{w}\mathbf{f}\|_{H^n}^2 &:= \sum_{|\alpha|\le n}\|D^\alpha(\sqrt{w}\mathbf{f})\|_{L^2}^2 = \sum_{|\alpha|\le k}\|\partial_1^{\alpha_1}\partial_2^{\alpha_2}\partial_3^{\alpha_3}(\sqrt{w}\mathbf{f})\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\le \sum_{|\alpha|\le n} 2^{|\alpha|}\sum_{l_1,l_2,l_3=0}^{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3}\binom{\alpha_1}{l_1}^2\binom{\alpha_2}{l_2}^2\binom{\alpha_3}{l_3}^2 \left\| \left|\partial_1^{\alpha_1-l_1}\partial_2^{\alpha_2-l_2}\partial_3^{\alpha_3-l_3}\sqrt{w}\right| \partial_1^{l_1}\partial_2^{l_2}\partial_3^{l_3}\mathbf{f}\right\|_{L^2}^2 .\end{aligned}$$

But as $w \in \mathcal{W}^k$, there is some finite constant C_9 such that $\left|\partial_1^{\alpha_1-l_1}\partial_2^{\alpha_2-l_2}\partial_3^{\alpha_3-l_3}\sqrt{w}\right| \le C_9\sqrt{w}$ and, hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\ldots &\le \sum_{|\alpha|\le k} 2^{|\alpha|}\sum_{l_1,l_2,l_3=0}^{\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\alpha_3}\binom{\alpha_1}{l_1}^2\binom{\alpha_2}{l_2}^2\binom{\alpha_3}{l_3}^2 C_9 \left\|\partial_1^{l_1}\partial_2^{l_2}\partial_3^{l_3}\mathbf{g}\right\|_{L_w^2}^2 \\ &\le C_{10}\|\mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^n}^2 < \infty\end{aligned}$$

This implies $\mathbf{f} \in H_w^k \Rightarrow \sqrt{w}\mathbf{f} \in H^k$, i.e. $\sqrt{w}H^k \subseteq H_w^k$. A similar computation using the estimate from Lemma 2.12 yields $\frac{\mathbf{g}}{\sqrt{w}} \in H_w^k \Rightarrow \mathbf{g} \in H^k$, i.e. $H_w^k \subseteq \sqrt{w}H^k$. □

Theorem 2.17 (Sobolev's Lemma and Morrey's Inequality for Weighted Spaces)**.** *Let* $k \ge 2$*, then:*

- *(i)* $\mathbf{f} \in H_w^k(O,\mathbb{R}^3)$ *for an open* $O \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^3$ *and* $w \in \mathcal{W}$ *implies that there is a* $\mathbf{g} \in C^l(O,\mathbb{R}^3)$, $0 \le l \le k-2$, *such that* $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{g}$ *almost everywhere on* O.
- *(ii)* $\mathbf{f} \in H_w^k(O,\mathbb{R}^3)$ *for all* $O \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^3$ *and* $w \in \mathcal{W}$ *implies that there is a* $\mathbf{g} \in C^l(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^3)$, $0 \le l \le k-2$, *such that almost everywhere* $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{g}$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^3$.
- *(iii)* $\mathbf{f} \in H_w^k(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^3)$ *and* $w \in \mathcal{W}^k$ *implies that there is a possibly* k *dependent* $C < \infty$ *such that*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathbb{R}^3}\sum_{|\alpha|\le k-2}\|D^\alpha\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\| \le C\|\mathbf{f}\|_{H_w^k}. \tag{29}$$

Proof. (i) For any open set $O \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^3$, $\mathbf{f} \in H_w^k(O,\mathbb{R}^3)$ implies $\mathbf{f} \in H^k(O,\mathbb{R}^3)$ due to Lemma 2.11. Sobolev's lemma [SR75, IX.24] states that there is then a $\mathbf{g} \in C^l(O,\mathbb{R}^3)$ for $0 \le l < n - \frac{3}{2}$ with $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{g}$ almost everywhere on O. Claim (ii) follows by (i) and continuity. (iii) For $w \in \mathcal{W}^k$ we know from Lemma 2.16 that $\mathbf{f} \in \sqrt{w}H^k(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R}^3)$. Applying Sobolev's lemma as in (i) we yield the same result for $O = \mathbb{R}^3$ which provides the conditions for Morrey's inequality (29) to hold, see [Lie01, Chapter 8, Theorem 8.8(iii), p.213]. □

REMARK 2.18. *Note that Theorem 2.17 is the only result that depends on the dimension of* $\mathbb{R}^3$.

2.2 Proof of Global Existence and Uniqueness of ML solutions

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Assertion (i) and (ii): We intend to use the abstract existence and uniqueness statement of Theorem A.3 for $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{H}_w$. In order to do so we need to show that the operators A and J from Definitions 2.3 and 2.4 have the properties as given in Definitions A.1 and A.2, respectively, and that the needed a priori bound for Theorem A.3(iii) holds. The needed properties of A and J are shown in Lemma 2.19 and Lemma 2.22. The a priori bound is provided by Lemma 2.24.

Lemma 2.19 (A fulfills the requirements)**.** *The operator A introduced in Definition 2.3 on $D_w(A)$ with weight $w \in \mathcal{W}^1$ fulfills all properties of Definition A.1 with $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{H}_w$, i.e.*

(i) A is closed and densely defined.

(ii) There exists a $\gamma \geq 0$ such that $(-\infty, -\gamma) \cup (\gamma, \infty) \subseteq \rho(A)$, the resolvent set of A.

(iii) The resolvent $R_\lambda(A) = \frac{1}{\lambda - A}$ of A with respect to $\lambda \in \rho(A)$ is bounded by $\frac{1}{|\lambda|-\gamma}$, i.e. for all $\phi \in \mathcal{H}_w, |\lambda| > \gamma$ we have $\|R_\lambda(A)\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \frac{1}{|\lambda|-\gamma}\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}$.

Proof. In Definition 2.3 the operator A was given in terms of the operator $\mathtt{A}$ on $\mathcal{D} := H_w^{curl} \oplus H_w^{curl}$. We abbreviate the Hilbert space direct sum $\mathcal{L} := L_w^2 \oplus L_w^2$ and express vectors $f \in \mathcal{L}$ componentwise as $f = (f_1, f_2)$.

First, we prove that $\mathtt{A}$ is closed and densely defined: According to Theorem 2.10, H_w^{curl} is a Hilbert space so that $\mathcal{D}$ is a Banach space with respect to the norm $\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{D}} := \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{L}} + \|\mathtt{A}\varphi\|_{\mathcal{L}}$. This means any sequence $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{D}$ such that $(u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(\mathtt{A}u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges in $\mathcal{L}$ to u and v, respectively, converges also with respect to $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}}$. This implies $u \in \mathcal{D}$ and $v = \mathtt{A}u$, i.e. $\mathtt{A}$ is closed. Theorem 2.13 ensures that C_c^∞ is dense in H_w^{curl}. Hence, $C_c^\infty \oplus C_c^\infty \subset \mathcal{D}$ lies dense in $\mathcal{L}$. Thus, the operator $\mathtt{A}$ is densely defined.

Next we prove that there exists a $\gamma \geq 0$ such that $(-\infty, -\gamma) \cup (\gamma, \infty) \subset \rho(\mathtt{A})$ which means that for all $|\lambda| > \gamma$

$$(\lambda - \mathtt{A}) : \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{L} \tag{30}$$

is a bijection: Let $\mathcal{S}$ denote the Schwartz space of infinitely often differentiable $\mathbb{R}^3$ valued functions on $\mathbb{R}^3$ with faster than polynomial decay, and let $\mathcal{S}^*$ denote the dual of $\mathcal{S}$. On $\mathcal{S}^* \oplus \mathcal{S}^*$ we regard in matrix notation

$$(\lambda - \mathtt{A})\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & -\nabla\wedge \\ \nabla\wedge & \lambda \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

for $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{S}^*$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. With the use of the Fourier transformation $\widehat{\cdot}$ and its inverse $\widetilde{\cdot}$ on $\mathcal{S}^*$ we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} \lambda & -\nabla\wedge \\ \nabla\wedge & \lambda \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} T_1 \\ T_2 \end{pmatrix}[\mathbf{u}] = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda T_1[\mathbf{u}] - \nabla \wedge T_2[\mathbf{u}] \\ \lambda T_2[\mathbf{u}] + \nabla \wedge T_1[\mathbf{u}] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{T}_1[\lambda\widehat{\mathbf{u}}] - \widetilde{T}_2[\mathbf{k} \mapsto i\mathbf{k} \wedge \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{k})] \\ \widetilde{T}_2[\lambda\widehat{\mathbf{u}}] + \widetilde{T}_1[\mathbf{k} \mapsto i\mathbf{k} \wedge \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{k})] \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

for all $u \in \mathcal{S}$. Here, e.g. $T_1[u]$ denotes the evaluation of the distribution T_1 on test function $\mathbf{u}$. By plugging the second equation into the first for $\lambda \neq 0$, one finds

$$0 = \widetilde{T}_1\left[\mathbf{k} \mapsto (\lambda^2 + |\mathbf{k}|^2)\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{k}) - \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{k} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{k}))\right] =: R_1[\widehat{\mathbf{u}}]$$

for all $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{S}$. However, for each $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{S}$ we find a $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{S}$ according to

$$\widehat{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\lambda^2 \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(\mathbf{k}) + \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{k} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{v}}(\mathbf{k}))}{\lambda^2(\lambda^2 + |\mathbf{k}|^2)}$$

such that $T_1[\mathbf{v}] = \widetilde{T}_1[\widehat{\mathbf{v}}] = R_1[\widehat{\mathbf{u}}] = 0$, which means that $T_1 = 0$, and hence, also $T_2 = 0$ on $\mathcal{S}^*$. We have thus shown that $\text{Ker}(\lambda - \mathtt{A}) = \{0\}$ since $H_w^{curl} \oplus H_w^{curl} \subset \mathcal{S}^* \oplus \mathcal{S}^*$. Therefore, mapping (30) is injective for $\lambda \neq 0$.

We shall now see that there exists a $\gamma > 0$ such that for all $|\lambda| > \gamma$ this mapping is also surjective, i.e. $\text{Range}(\lambda - \mathtt{A}) = \mathcal{L}$. Let $v \in \text{Range}(\lambda - \mathtt{A})^\perp$. Since C_c^∞ is dense in H_w^{curl}, cf. Theorem 2.13, we may use partial integration from which we obtain

$$0 = \langle (\lambda - \mathtt{A})u, v \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} = \int d^3x \; w(\mathbf{x}) u(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \frac{((\lambda + \mathtt{A}) w(\mathbf{x}) v(\mathbf{x}))}{w(\mathbf{x})} =: \langle u, (\lambda - \mathtt{A})^* v \rangle_{\mathcal{L}}$$

for $u \in \mathcal{D}$. On the other hand, we have shown that $\text{Ker}(\lambda - \mathtt{A}) = \{0\}$ for all $\lambda \neq 0$, hence wv must be zero which implies that $v = 0$ since $w \in \mathcal{W}^1$. Thus, $\text{Range}(\lambda - \mathtt{A})$ is dense, so that $\mathcal{L} = \overline{\text{Range}(\lambda - \mathtt{A})}$.

As $(\lambda - \mathtt{A}) : \mathcal{D} \to \text{Range}(\lambda - \mathtt{A})$ is bijective, we can define $R_\lambda(\mathtt{A})$ to be its inverse. Next, we show the boundedness of $R_\lambda(\mathtt{A})$ which implies the closedness of $\text{Range}(\lambda - \mathtt{A})$. Let $f \in \text{Range}(\lambda - \mathtt{A})$, then there is a unique $u \in \mathcal{D}$ which solves $(\lambda - \mathtt{A})u = f$. The inner product with u gives $\langle u, (\lambda - \mathtt{A})u \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} = \langle u, f \rangle_{\mathcal{L}}$ and with the Schwarz inequality and the symmetry of the inner product it implies

$$|\lambda| \, \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}}^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left| \langle u, \mathtt{A}u \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} + \langle u, \mathtt{A}u \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} \right| \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}} \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}}. \tag{31}$$

In the notation $u = (u_1, u_2)$ a partial integration yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle u, \mathtt{A}u \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} + \langle u, \mathtt{A}u \rangle_{\mathcal{L}} \right| &= \left| \int d^3x \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\nabla w(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \\ \nabla w(\mathbf{x}) \wedge & 0 \end{pmatrix} u(\mathbf{x}) \cdot u(\mathbf{x}) \right| \\ &\leq \int d^3x \; |(\nabla w(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x})) - (\nabla w(\mathbf{x}) \wedge \mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x}))| \\ &\leq 2C_\nabla \int d^3x \; w(\mathbf{x}) \, |\mathbf{u}_1(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \mathbf{u}_2(\mathbf{x}))| \leq 2C_\nabla \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}}^2. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used Schwarz's inequality and the constant $C_\nabla := \sqrt{\sum_{|\alpha|=1} (C^\alpha)^2}$ coming from the bound on w given by Lemma 2.12. Let us define $\gamma := C_\nabla$. Hence, for $|\lambda| > \gamma$ we obtain the estimate

$$\|R_\lambda(\mathtt{A}) f\|_{\mathcal{L}} = \|u\|_{\mathcal{L}} \leq \frac{1}{|\lambda| - \gamma} \|f\|_{\mathcal{L}} \tag{32}$$

from (31). As $\text{Range}(\lambda - \mathtt{A})$ is dense, there is a unique extension of $R_\lambda(\mathtt{A})$ that we denote by the same symbol $R_\lambda(\mathtt{A}) : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{D}$ which obeys the same bound (32) on whole $\mathcal{L}$.

Next, we show that $\text{Range}(\lambda - \mathtt{A})$ is closed. Let $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\text{Range}(\lambda - \mathtt{A})$ which converges in $\mathcal{L}$ for $|\lambda| > \gamma$. Define $u_n := R_\lambda(\mathtt{A}) f_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By (32) we immediately infer convergence of the sequence $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to some u in $\mathcal{L}$. Thus, $(u_n, (\lambda - \mathtt{A})u_n) = (u_n, f_n)$ converge to (u, f) in $\mathcal{L}$, and because $\mathtt{A}$ is closed, $u \in \mathcal{D}$ and $(\lambda - \mathtt{A})u = f$. Hence, $f \in \text{Range}(\lambda - \mathtt{A})$

and Range$(\lambda - \mathtt{A})$ is closed. Since we have shown that Range$(\lambda - \mathtt{A})$ is closed, we have also Range$(\lambda - \mathtt{A}) = \mathcal{L}$. Hence, for all $|\lambda| > \gamma$ the mapping (30) is a bijection.

Finally, we show that A inherits these properties from $\mathtt{A}$: Let $\varphi = (\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)_{1\le i\le N} \in D_w(A)$. By definition $A\varphi = (0, 0, \mathtt{A}(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i))_{1\le i\le N}$ holds. Since $\mathtt{A}$ is closed on $\mathcal{D} = H_w^{curl} \oplus H_w^{curl}$, A is closed on $D_w(A) := \oplus_{i=1}^N \left(\mathbb{R}^3 \oplus \mathbb{R}^3 \oplus \mathcal{D}\right)$, and $\oplus_{i=1}^N \left(\mathbb{R}^3 \oplus \mathbb{R}^3 \oplus C_c^\infty \oplus C_c^\infty\right) \subset D_w(A)$ lies dense in $\mathcal{H}_w$. This implies property (i) of Definition A.1. Furthermore, as for $|\lambda| > \gamma \ge 0$

$$(\lambda - A)(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)_{1\le i\le n} = (\lambda\mathbf{q}_i, \lambda\mathbf{p}_i, (\lambda - \mathtt{A})(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i))_{1\le i\le n}.$$

As $\lambda \neq 0$, $(\lambda - A) : D_w(A) \to \mathcal{H}_w$ is a bijection and for $(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)_{1\le i\le n} \in \mathcal{H}_w$ its inverse $R_\lambda(A)$ is given by

$$R_\lambda(A)(\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)_{1\le i\le n} = \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\mathbf{q}_i, \frac{1}{\lambda}\mathbf{p}_i, R_\lambda(\mathtt{A})(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)\right)_{1\le i\le n}.$$

Therefore, $(-\infty, -\gamma) \cup (\gamma, \infty)$ is a subset of the resolvent set $\rho(A)$ of A. This implies property (ii) of Definition A.1. Finally, by (32) we have the estimate

$$\|R_\lambda(A)\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{\lambda^2}\|\mathbf{q}_i\|^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\|\mathbf{p}_i\|^2 + \|R_\lambda(\mathtt{A})(\mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)\|_{\mathcal{L}}^2\right)} \le \frac{1}{|\lambda| - \gamma}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}$$

which implies property (iii) of Definition A.1 and concludes the proof. □

This lemma together with Lemma A.5 states that A on $D_w(A)$ generates a γ-contractive group $(W_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ which gives rise to the next definition:

Definition 2.20 (Free Maxwell Time Evolution)**.** *We denote by* $(W_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ *the* γ*-contractive group on* $\mathcal{H}_w$ *generated by* A *on* $D_w(A)$*.*

REMARK 2.21. $(W_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ *comes with a standard bound* $\|W_t\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \le e^{\gamma|t|}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}$ *for all* $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_w$*, see Lemma A.5. For the case that w is a constant, one finds* $\gamma = 0$ *and the whole proof above collapses into an argument about skew-adjointness on* L^2*. In this case,* $(W_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ *is simply the unitary group generated by the skew-adjoint operator A. For non-constant w,* $(W_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ *does not preserve the norm. For example, consider a weight w that decreases with the distance to the origin. Then, any wave packet moving towards the origin while retaining its shape (like e.g. solutions to the free Maxwell equations) has necessarily an* L^2_w *norm of its fields that increases in time.*

Lemma 2.22 (J fulfills the requirements)**.** *The operator J introduced in Definition 2.4 with a weight* $w \in \mathcal{W}$ *fulfills all properties of Definition A.2 with* $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{H}_w$*, i.e. for an* $n_J \in \mathbb{N}$*, J mappings* $D(A)$ *to* $D(A^{n_J})$ *and has the properties:*

(i) For all $0 \le n \le n_J$ *there exist* $C_{11}{}^{(n)}, C_{12}{}^{(n)} \in \mathtt{Bounds}$ *such that for all* $\varphi, \widetilde{\varphi} \in D(A)$

$$\|A^n J(\varphi)\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \le C_{11}{}^{(n)}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}), \tag{33}$$

$$\|A^n(J(\varphi) - J(\widetilde{\varphi}))\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \le C_{12}{}^{(n)}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})\ \|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}. \tag{34}$$

(ii) For all $0 \le n \le n_J$ *and* $T > 0$*,* $t \in (-T, T)$ *and any* $\varphi_{(\cdot)} \in C^n((-T, T), D(A^n))$ *such that* $\frac{d^k}{dt^k}\varphi_t \in D(A^{n-k})$ *for* $k \le n$*, the operator J fulfills for* $j + l \le n - 1$*:*

(a) $\frac{d^j}{dt^j}A^l J(\varphi_t) \in D(A^{n-1-j-l})$ *and*

(b) $t \mapsto \frac{d^j}{dt^j}A^l J(\varphi_t)$ *is continuous on* $(-T,T)$*.*

Furthermore,

(iii) there exists a $C_J \in \texttt{Bounds}$ *such that*

$$\|J(\varphi)\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \leq C_J\left(\|w^{-1/2}\varrho_i\|_{L^2}, \|\varrho_i\|_{L^2_w}; 1 \leq i \leq N\right)\sum_{i=1}^N (1 + C_w\|\mathbf{q}_i\|)^{\frac{P_w}{2}}\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \tag{35}$$

for any $\varphi = (\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)_{1\leq i\leq N} \in \mathcal{H}_w$ *where* C_w *and* P_w *only depend on w, cf. (18).*

Proof. As remarked below Definition 2.4, J is a well-defined mapping from $\mathcal{H}_w$ to $D_w(A^\infty)$.

Assertion (i): Choose $\varphi = (\mathbf{q}_i, \mathbf{p}_i, \mathbf{E}_i, \mathbf{B}_i)_{1\leq i\leq N}$ and $\widetilde{\varphi} = (\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i, \widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i, \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_i, \widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_i)_{1\leq i\leq N}$ in $\mathcal{H}_w$. According to Definition 2.4, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$J(\varphi) := \left(\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i), \sum_{j=1}^N e_{ij}\int d^3x\, \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i)\left(\mathbf{E}_j(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) \wedge \mathbf{B}_j(x)\right), -4\pi\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i), 0\right)_{1\leq i\leq N} \tag{36}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A^{2n+1}J(\varphi) &:= \left(0, 0, 0, (-1)^n 4\pi(\nabla\wedge)^{2n+1}\left(\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i)\right)\right)_{1\leq i\leq N}, \\ A^{2n+2}J(\varphi) &:= \left(0, 0, (-1)^n 4\pi(\nabla\wedge)^{2n+2}\left(\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i)\right), 0\right)_{1\leq i\leq N}. \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Since $J(0) = 0$, inequality (34) for $\widetilde{\varphi} = 0$ gives $C_{11}{}^{(n)}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) := C_{12}{}^{(n)}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, 0)$. Therefore, it suffices to prove (34). The only involved case therein is $n = 0$ as one needs to control the Lorentz force on each rigid charge, which for $n > 0$ is mapped to zero by any power of A. For $n = 0$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|J(\varphi) - J(\widetilde{\varphi})\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \leq& \sum_{i=1}^N \left\|\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) - \mathbf{v}(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i)\right\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} + \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^N \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N e_{ij}\int d^3x\,\Big(\varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i)\mathbf{E}_j(\mathbf{x}) - \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_j(\mathbf{x}) + \right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i)\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) \wedge \mathbf{B}_j(\mathbf{x}) - \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\mathbf{v}(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i) \wedge \widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j(\mathbf{x})\Big)\right\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} + \\ &+ 4\pi\sum_{i=1}^N \left\|\mathbf{v}(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i)\varrho_i(\cdot - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i) - \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i)\right\|_{L^2_w} =: \boxed{1} + \boxed{2} + \boxed{3}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

The following notation is convenient: For any function $(f_i)_{1\leq i\leq m} = f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ and $(x_j)_{1\leq j\leq n} = x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we denote by Df the Jacobi matrix of f with entries $Df(x)|_{i,j} = \partial_j f_i(x)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$. Furthermore, for any vector space V with norm $\|\cdot\|_V$ and any operator T on V we write $\|T\|_V := \sup_{\|v\|_V\leq 1}\|T(v)\|_V$.

Recall also the coefficients $m_i \neq 0$, $|\sigma_i| = 1$ and $e_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq N$ from Definition 2.4 and define $e := \max_{1\leq i,j\leq N}|e_{ij}|$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\varrho_i > 0$, $1 \leq i \leq N$, with the possible signs being absorbed in e_{ij}.

By the mean value theorem, for each index i there exists a $\lambda_i \in [0,1]$ such that for $\mathbf{k}_i := \mathbf{p}_i + \lambda_i(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i - \mathbf{p}_i)$ we obtain

$$\boxed{1} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| D\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{k}_i) \cdot (\mathbf{p}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|D\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{k}_i)\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \|\mathbf{p}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}.$$

Now with $\mathbf{k}_i = (\mathbf{k}_i)_{1 \leq j \leq 3}$ we have $D\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{k}_i)\Big|_{j,l} = \frac{\sigma_i}{\sqrt{m_i^2 + \mathbf{k}_i^2}} \left(\delta_{jl} - \frac{(\mathbf{k}_i)_j (\mathbf{k}_i)_l}{m_i^2 + \mathbf{k}_i^2} \right)$. Thus, it follows $\|D\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{k}_i)\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \leq K_{vel}$ for $K_{vel} := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{2}{|m_i|}$ so that

$$\boxed{1} \leq K_{vel} \, \|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}. \tag{39}$$

Next we must get a bound on the Lorentz force. For $z \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $R > 0$ we define $B_R(\mathbf{z}) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}\| < R\}$. Choose $R > 0$ such that for $1 \leq i \leq N$ it holds $\operatorname{supp} \varrho_i \subseteq B_R(0)$. Define $I_i := B_R(\mathbf{q}_i) \cup B_R(\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \boxed{2} \leq e \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} & \left\| \int_{I_i} d^3x \left(\varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i)\mathbf{E}_j(\mathbf{x}) - \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_j(\mathbf{x}) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} + \\ + e \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} & \left\| \int_{I_i} d^3x \left(\varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i)\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) \wedge \mathbf{B}_j(\mathbf{x}) - \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\mathbf{v}(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i) \wedge \widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j(\mathbf{x}) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} =: \boxed{4} + \boxed{5}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{z}_i(\kappa) := \mathbf{q}_i + \kappa(\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i - \mathbf{q}_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq N$ and $\kappa \in [0,1]$, then

$$\varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i) = \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i) + \int_0^1 d\kappa \, (\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i - \mathbf{q}_i) \cdot \nabla\varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_i(\kappa)).$$

Now $\left| \int_0^1 d\kappa \, (\mathbf{q}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i) \cdot \nabla\varrho_i(x - \mathbf{z}_i(\kappa)) \right| \leq K_\varrho \|\mathbf{q}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}$ for $K_\varrho := \sum_{i=1,|\alpha| \leq n+1}^{N} \|D^\alpha \varrho_i\|_{L^\infty}$ so that

$$\boxed{4} \leq e \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \int_{I_i} d^3x \, \left[\varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i) \|\mathbf{E}_j(\mathbf{x}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_j(\mathbf{x}))\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} + K_\varrho \|\mathbf{q}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \|\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_j(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \right].$$

In the following we denote the characteristic function of a set M by $\mathbb{1}_M$. The following type of estimates will be used frequently: For $\mathbf{F} \in L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ it holds

$$\int_{I_i} d^3x \, \|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \leq \left[(1 + C_w\|\mathbf{q}_i\|)^{P_w} + (1 + C_w\|\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i\|)^{P_w} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \frac{\mathbb{1}_{B_R(0)}}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L^2_w}, \tag{40}$$

$$\int d^3x \, \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i) \|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \leq (1 + C_w\|\mathbf{q}_i\|)^{\frac{P_w}{2}} \left\| \frac{\varrho_i}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2} \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \tag{41}$$

The former inequality can be seen by Schwarz's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I_i} d^3x \, \|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} &= \int_{I_i} d^3x \, \frac{\sqrt{w(\mathbf{x})}}{\sqrt{w(\mathbf{x})}} \|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \leq \left(\int_{I_i} d^3x \, w^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L^2_w} \\ &\leq \left(\int_{B_R(0)} d^3x \, (w^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i) + w^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L^2_w}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the weight estimate (20) yields (40). Similarly the latter inequality can be seen by

$$\begin{aligned}\int d^3x\, \varrho_i(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i)\|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} &= \int d^3x\, \frac{\varrho_i(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i)}{\sqrt{w(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i)}}\sqrt{w(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i)}\|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}\\ &\leq \left\|\frac{\varrho_i}{\sqrt{w}}\right\|_{L^2}\left(\int d^3x\, w(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i)\|\mathbf{F}\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\end{aligned}$$

and again using the weight estimate (20). We abbreviate

$$f(x,y) := \left[(1+C_w x)^{P_w} + (1+C_w y)^{P_w}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\|\frac{\mathbb{1}_{B_R(0)}}{\sqrt{w}}\right\|_{L^2}, \qquad g(x) := (1+C_w x)^{\frac{P_w}{2}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\|\frac{\varrho_i}{\sqrt{w}}\right\|_{L^2}$$

so that (40) and (41) give

$$\int_{I_i} d^3x\, \|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \leq f\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\mathbf{F}\|_{L^2_w}, \tag{42}$$

$$\int d^3x\, \varrho_i(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i)\|\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \leq g\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\mathbf{F}\|_{L^2_w(\mathbb{R}^3)}. \tag{43}$$

We apply these estimates to the term

$$\begin{aligned}\boxed{4} &\leq e\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} g\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\mathbf{E}_j - \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_j\|_{L^2_w} + e\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} K_\varrho\|\mathbf{q}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} g\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}_j\|_{L^2_w}\\ &\leq eNg\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} + eK_\varrho\|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} f\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\end{aligned}$$

and obtain

$$\boxed{4} \leq C_{13}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})\,\|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}$$

for

$$C_{13}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) := e\left(Ng\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right) + K_\varrho f\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right).$$

In the same way we estimate

$$\boxed{5} = e\sum_{i,j=1}^{N}\left\|\int_{I_i} d^3x\left(\varrho_i(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i)\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)\wedge\mathbf{B}_j(\mathbf{x}) - \varrho_i(\mathbf{x}-\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\mathbf{v}(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i)\wedge\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j(\mathbf{x})\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}.$$

First we apply the mean value theorem to the velocities as we did before such that

$$\begin{aligned}\ldots &\leq e\sum_{i,j=1}^{N}\int_{I_i} d^3x\left\|\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)\wedge\left(\varrho_i(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i)\mathbf{B}_j(\mathbf{x}) - \varrho_i(\mathbf{x}-\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j(\mathbf{x})\right)\right\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}\\ &\quad + e\sum_{i,j=1}^{N}\int_{I_i} d^3x\, K_{vel}\|\mathbf{p}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}\varrho_i(\mathbf{x}-\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\|\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}.\end{aligned}$$

Then again we rewrite the densities by the fundamental theorem of calculus and use $\|\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \leq 1$ in order to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\ldots \leq{}& e\sum_{i,j=1}^{N}\int_{I_i} d^3x\,\varrho_i(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{q}_i)\|\mathbf{B}_j(\mathbf{x})-\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} + e\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} K_\varrho\|\mathbf{q}_i-\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}\int_{I_i} d^3x\,\|\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}+\\ &+ e\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} K_{vel}\|\mathbf{p}_i-\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}\int_{I_i} d^3x\,\varrho_i(\mathbf{x}-\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\|\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally we apply the two estimates (42) and (43) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\ldots \leq{}& e\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} g\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\mathbf{B}_j-\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j\|_{L^2_w} + e\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} K_\varrho\|\mathbf{q}_i-\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} f\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w},\|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j(\mathbf{x})\|_{L^2_w}+\\ &+ e\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} K_{vel}\|\mathbf{p}_i-\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} g\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j(\mathbf{x})\|_{L^2_w}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain the estimate

$$\boxed{5} \leq C_{14}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w},\|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})\,\|\varphi-\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}$$

for

$$C_{14}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w},\|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) := e\Big(Ng\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right) + K_\varrho f\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w},\|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} + K_{vel} g\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right)\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\Big).$$

It remains to estimate term $\boxed{3}$. We shall do this already for the general case of any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Recall from equation (37) that

$$\boxed{3}_n := 4\pi\sum_{i=1}^{N}\|(\nabla\wedge)^n\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)\varrho_i(\cdot-\mathbf{q}_i)-(\nabla\wedge)^n\mathbf{v}(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i)\varrho_i(\cdot-\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\|_{L^2_w}.$$

We begin with

$$\begin{aligned}\boxed{3}_n \leq{}& 4\pi\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\|(\nabla\wedge)^n\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)\left(\varrho_i(\cdot-\mathbf{q}_i)-\varrho_i(\cdot-\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\right)\right\|_{L^2_w}+\\ &+ 4\pi\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\|(\nabla\wedge)^n(\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)-\mathbf{v}(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i))\varrho_i(\cdot-\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\right\|_{L^2_w} =: \boxed{6}_n + \boxed{7}_n\end{aligned}$$

but before we continue we shall express these terms in a more convenient way. For all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3,\mathbb{R})$ and all $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (using the notation $\triangle^{-1} = 0$) the following identities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla\wedge)^{2m}(\mathbf{v}h) &= (-1)^{m-1}\left[\nabla\left(\mathbf{v}\cdot\nabla\triangle^{m-1}h\right)-\mathbf{v}\triangle^m h\right],\\ (\nabla\wedge)^{2m+1}(\mathbf{v}h) &= (-1)^m[\nabla\triangle^m h]\wedge\mathbf{v}.\end{aligned}$$

Let us begin with term $\boxed{6}_n$ for odd n. As before we write $\mathbf{z}_i(\kappa) = \mathbf{q}_i + \kappa(\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i - \mathbf{q}_i)$ for each $1 \le i \le N$ and $\kappa \in [0,1]$ so that for

$$K_I\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\mathbb{1}_{I_i}\|_{L^2_w} = N\|\mathbb{1}_{B_R(0)}\|_{L^2_w}\left[(1 + C_w\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})^{P_w} + (1 + C_w\|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})^{P_w}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{44}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\boxed{6}_{n=2m+1} &= 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \nabla\triangle^m \left[\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i) - \varrho_i(\cdot - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\right] \wedge \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) \right\|_{L^2_w} \\
&\le 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \int_0^1 d\kappa\; D[\nabla\triangle^m \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_i(\kappa))] \cdot (\mathbf{q}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i) \right\|_{L^2_w} \le 4\pi K_\varrho \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\mathbb{1}_{I_i}\|_{L^2_w} \|\mathbf{q}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \\
&\le 4\pi K_\varrho K_I\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right) \|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} =: C_{15}(2m+1, \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})\, \|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}.
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Similarly the term $\boxed{6}_n$ for even n gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\boxed{6}_{n=2m} = 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Big\| &\nabla\left(\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) \cdot \nabla\triangle^{m-1}\left[\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i) - \varrho_i(\cdot - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\right]\right) + \\
&- \mathbf{v}(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i)\triangle^m \left[\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i) - \varrho_i(\cdot - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\right] \Big\|_{L^2_w} \\
\le 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Bigg(&\left\| \mathbb{1}_{I_i} \int_0^1 d\kappa\; D\left[D\left[\nabla\triangle^{m-1}\varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_i(\kappa))\right] \cdot (\mathbf{q}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i)\right] \cdot \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) \right\|_{L^2_w} + \\
&+ \left\| \mathbb{1}_{I_i} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) \int_0^1 d\kappa\; D\triangle^m \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}_i(\kappa)) \cdot (\mathbf{q}_i - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i) \right\|_{L^2_w} \Bigg).
\end{aligned}$$

Again we estimate the coefficients of the Jacobi matrices by K_ϱ obtaining a factor $\sqrt{3}$ in the first summand such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\boxed{6}_{n=2m} &\le 4\pi K_I\left(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}\right) K_\varrho(\sqrt{3} + 1)\|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \\
&=: C_{15}(2m, \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})\, \|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}.
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The last term to be estimated for odd n is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\boxed{7}_{n=2m} &= 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \nabla\triangle^m \varrho_i(\cdot - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i) \wedge \left[\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) - \mathbf{v}(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i)\right] \right\|_{L^2_w} \\
&\le 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \nabla\triangle^m \varrho_i(\cdot - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i) \right\|_{L^2_w} K_{vel}\|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \\
&\le 4\pi(1 + C_w\|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})^{\frac{P_w}{2}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\nabla\triangle^m \varrho_i\|_{L^2_w} K_{vel}\|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \\
&=: C_{16}(2m+1, \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})\, \|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w},
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

and for even n:

$$\begin{aligned}
\boxed{7}_{n=2m} &= 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \nabla \left([\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) - \mathbf{v}(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i)] \cdot \nabla \triangle^{m-1} \varrho_i(\cdot - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i) \right) - [\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) - \mathbf{v}(\widetilde{\mathbf{p}}_i)] \, \triangle^m \varrho_i(\cdot - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i) \right\|_{L^2_w} \\
&\leq 4\pi \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\left(\int d^3x \; w(\mathbf{x}) \| D\nabla\triangle^{m-1} \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i) \|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \| \triangle^m \varrho_i(\cdot - \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}_i) \|_{L^2_w} \right) K_{vel} \| \varphi - \widetilde{\varphi} \|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \\
&\leq 4\pi N (1 + C_w \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})^{\frac{P_w}{2}} \left(\left(\int d^3x \; w(\mathbf{x}) \| D\nabla\triangle^{m-1} \varrho_i(\mathbf{x}) \|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \| \triangle^m \varrho_i \|_{L^2_w} \right) K_{vel} \| \varphi - \widetilde{\varphi} \|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \\
&=: C_{16}(2m, \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) \| \varphi - \widetilde{\varphi} \|_{\mathcal{H}_w}. \qquad (48)
\end{aligned}$$

Collecting all estimates we finally arrive at the inequality (34) for

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_{12}{}^{(n)}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) := K_{vel} + C_{13}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) + \\
&\quad + C_{14}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) + C_{15}(2m+1, \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) + C_{16}(2m+1, \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})
\end{aligned}$$

which for fixed n is a continuous and non-decreasing function in the arguments $\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}$ and $\|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}$, and hence, $C_{12}{}^{(n)} \in$ `Bounds`.

Assertion (ii): For $T > 0$ let $t \mapsto \varphi_t$ be a mapping in $C^n((-T,T), D_w(A^n))$ such that for all $k \leq n$ and $t \in (-T,T)$ it holds that $\frac{d^k}{dt^k}\varphi_t \in D_w(A^{n-k})$. We have to show that for all $j + l \leq n - 1$, $t \mapsto \frac{d^j}{dt^j} A^l J(\varphi_t)$ is continuous on $(-T,T)$ and take values in $D_w(A^{n-1-j-l})$. By formulas (36) and (37) both properties are an immediate consequence of $\varrho_i \in C_c^\infty$. In fact, one finds that $t \mapsto \frac{d^j}{dt^j} A^l J(\varphi_t)$ takes values in $D_w(A^\infty)$ on $(-T,T)$.

Finally, we prove assertion (iii), i.e. inequality (35): In principle we could use (38) and the estimates (39, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 48) for $\widetilde{\varphi} = 0$ so that we only had to treat the Lorentz force. However, this way we do not get an optimal dependence of the bounds on ϱ. Therefore, we regard

$$\begin{aligned}
\|J(\varphi)\| \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} \Bigg[&\|\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i)\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} + \left\| \sum_{j \neq i} e_{ij} \int d^3x \; \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i) \left(\mathbf{E}_j(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) \wedge \mathbf{B}_j(\mathbf{x}) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} + \\
&+ \|4\pi \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) \varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i)\|_{L^2_w} \Bigg] =: \boxed{8} + \boxed{9} + \boxed{10}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term can be treated as before, cf. (39),

$$\boxed{8} \leq N K_{vel} \; \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}.$$

The second term

$$\boxed{9} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{N} e_{ij} \int d^3x \; \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i) \left(\mathbf{E}_j(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_i) \wedge \mathbf{B}_j(x) \right) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}$$

can be bounded by

$$\ldots \leq e \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \int d^3x \; \varrho_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{q}_i) \left(\|\mathbf{E}_j(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} + \|\mathbf{B}_j(\mathbf{x})\|_{\mathbb{R}^3} \right). \qquad (49)$$

Using estimate (41) we find

$$\begin{aligned}\ldots &\le e \sum_{i=1}^{N} (1 + C_w \|\mathbf{q}_i\|)^{\frac{P_w}{2}} \left\| \frac{\varrho_i}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2} \sum_{j=1} \left(\|\mathbf{E}_j(\mathbf{x})\|_{L^2_w} + \|\mathbf{B}_j(\mathbf{x})\|_{L^2_w} \right) \\ &\le 2Ne \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \frac{\varrho_i}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (1 + C_w \|\mathbf{q}_i\|)^{\frac{P_w}{2}} \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the last term we obtain

$$\boxed{10} \le 4\pi K_{vel} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i)\|_{L^2_w} \, \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \le 4\pi K_{vel} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\varrho_i\|_{L^2_w} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (1 + C_w \|\mathbf{q}_i\|)^{P_w} \, \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}.$$

Hence, there is a $C_J \in$ `Bounds` for

$$C_J \left(\|\varrho_i\|_{L^2_w}, \|w^{-1/2} \varrho_i\|_{L^2}; 1 \le i \le N \right) := N K_{vel} + 2Ne \left\| \frac{\varrho_i}{\sqrt{w}} \right\|_{L^2} + 4\pi K_{vel} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \|\varrho_i\|_{L^2_w}.$$

This concludes the proof. □

REMARK 2.23. *Note that both cases, ML$_\varrho$ (16) as well as ML-SI$_\varrho$ (17), are treated in estimate (49) because the summation goes also over $i = j$. This is only possible because of the smearing of ϱ_i. In the point-particle limit this $i = j$ summand is the problematic term which blows up. On the contrary, in the ML-SI case with an appropriate choice of norms on the field spaces and an a priori lower bound on the distance of the charges for all times (in order to prevent singular situations like in classical gravitation [SMSM71]), the point-particle limit bares no obstacles.*

Next, we prove the needed a priori bound; the one assumed in (55).

Lemma 2.24 (A Priori Bound)**.** *Let $t \mapsto \varphi_t$ be a solution to*

$$\varphi_t = W_t \varphi^0 + \int_0^t W_{t-s} J(\varphi_s)$$

with $\varphi^0 = \varphi_t|_{t=0} \in D_w(A)$. Then there is a $C_{17} \in$ `Bounds` *such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [-T,T]} \|\varphi_t\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \le e^{\gamma T} (1 + C_{17} T e^{C_{17} T}) \|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \tag{50}$$

for $C_{17} := C_{17} \left(\|w^{-1/2} \varrho_i\|_{L^2}, \|\varrho_i\|_{L^2_w}; 1 \le i \le N \right)$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.19 we know that

$$\|\varphi_t\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} = \|W_t \varphi^0 + \int_0^t ds \, W_{t-s} J(\varphi_s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \le e^{\gamma T} \|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} + \mathrm{sign}(t) e^{\gamma T} \int_0^t ds \, \|J(\varphi_s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}.$$

Lemma 2.22 provides the bound to estimate the integrand

$$\|J(\varphi_s)\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \le C_J \sum_{i=1}^{N} (1 + C_w \|\mathbf{q}_{i,s}\|_{\mathbb{R}^3})^{\frac{P_w}{2}} \|\varphi_s\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}$$

for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, as the velocities are bounded by the speed of light we get in addition

$$\|\mathbf{q}_{i,s}\| = \left\| \mathbf{q}_i^0 + \int_0^s dr\ \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_{i_r}) \right\| \leq \|\mathbf{q}_i^0\| + \operatorname{sign}(s) \int_0^s dr \left\| \frac{\sigma_i \mathbf{p}_{i,r}}{\sqrt{m_i^2 + \mathbf{p}_{i,r}^2}} \right\| \leq \|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} + |s|.$$

Hence, for some finite $T > 0$ and $|t| \leq T$ we infer the following integral inequality

$$\|\varphi_t\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \leq e^{\gamma T} \|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} + \operatorname{sign}(t) C_{17}(T) \int_0^t ds\ \|\varphi_s\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}$$

for $C_{17}(T) := e^{\gamma T} C_J N (1 + C_w(\|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} + |T|))^{\frac{P_w}{2}}$, according to which by Grönwall's lemma

$$\sup_{t \in [-T,T]} \|\varphi_t\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \leq e^{\gamma T}(1 + C_{17} T e^{C_{17} T}) \|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \tag{51}$$

holds with the parameter dependence of C_J as claimed. This concludes the proof. □

Now we have all ingredients to apply Theorem A.3. Lemma 2.19 and Lemma 2.22 prove the needed properties of the operators A and J. Lemma 2.24 proves the needed a priori bound. Hence, Theorem A.3 ensures global existence and uniqueness of solutions to (22), to be precise, assertion (i) and (ii) except the bounds which we prove next:

Lemma 2.24 proves claim (24) for

$$C_2 := e^{\gamma T}(1 + C_{17} T e^{C_{17} T})$$

while (23) can be verified as follows. Let $T \geq 0$ and $\varphi, \widetilde{\varphi} : [-T, T] \to D_w(A)$ be solutions to (22), then for $t_0, t \in [-T, T]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_t - \widetilde{\varphi}_t\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} &= \left\| W_{t-t_0}(\varphi_{t_0} - \widetilde{\varphi}_{t_0}) + \int_{t_0}^t ds\ W_{t-s}(J(\varphi_s) - J(\widetilde{\varphi}_s)) \right\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \\ &\leq e^{\gamma T} \|\varphi_{t_0} - \widetilde{\varphi}_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} + \operatorname{sign}(t - t_0) e^{\gamma T} \int_{t_0}^t ds\ C_{12}{}^{(1)}(\|\varphi_s\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}_s\|_{\mathcal{H}_w})\ \|\varphi_s - \widetilde{\varphi}_s\|_{\mathcal{H}_w} \end{aligned}$$

by (34). Now we use (50) and find

$$C_{18}(T, \|\varphi_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) := \sup_{s \in [-T,T]} C_{12}{}^{(1)}(\|\varphi_s\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}_s\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) < \infty.$$

Hence, we can apply Grönwall's lemma once again and find that (23) holds for

$$C_1(T, \|\varphi_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) := e^{\gamma T}(1 + C_{18}(T, \|\varphi_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) T e^{C_{18}(T, \|\varphi_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}_{t_0}\|_{\mathcal{H}_w}) T}).$$

Finally we prove assertion (iii): We need to study whether solutions $t \mapsto \varphi_t$ respect the constraints (25). Without loss of generality we may assume $t^* = 0$. Say we are given an initial value $(\mathbf{q}_i^0, \mathbf{p}_i^0, \mathbf{E}_i^0, \mathbf{B}_i^0)_{1 \leq i \leq N} =: \varphi^0 \in D_w(A)$, then by part (i) and (ii) there exists a unique solution $t \mapsto \varphi_t$ in $C^1(\mathbb{R}, D_w(A))$ of equation (22). As before we use the notation $\varphi_t =: (\mathbf{q}_{i,t}, \mathbf{p}_{i,t}, \mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t})_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, let φ^0 be chosen in such a way that $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E}_i^0 = 4\pi \varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i^0)$ and $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}_i^0 = 0$ hold in the distribution sense. We may write the divergence of the magnetic field of the *i*-th particle for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$ in the distribution sense as

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}_{i,t} = \nabla \cdot \left(\mathbf{B}_i^0 + \int_0^t \dot{\mathbf{B}}_{i,s} \, ds \right) = -\nabla \cdot \int_0^t ds \, \nabla \wedge \mathbf{E}_{i,s}$$

where we have used the equation of motion (22) and the assumption $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{B}_i^0 = 0$. Since $\varphi_t \in D_w(A)$, $\nabla \wedge \mathbf{E}_{i,s}$ is in L^2_w. Therefore, for any $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R})$ we find by Fubini's theorem that

$$\int d^3x \, \nabla\phi(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \int_0^t ds \, \nabla \wedge \mathbf{E}_{i,s}(\mathbf{x}) = \int_0^t ds \int d^3x \, \nabla\phi(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\nabla \wedge \mathbf{E}_{i,s}(\mathbf{x})) = 0 \tag{52}$$

as for any fixed t

$$\int_0^t ds \int d^3x \, |\nabla\phi(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (\nabla \wedge \mathbf{E}_{i,s}(\mathbf{x}))| \leq \|\nabla\phi\|_{L^2_w} t \sup_{s \in [0,t]} \|\nabla \wedge \mathbf{E}_{i,s}\|_{L^2_w} \leq \infty$$

holds. The supremum exists because of continuity. Analogously, we find for the electric fields

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{E}_{i,t} &= \nabla \cdot \left(\mathbf{E}_i^0 + \int_0^t ds \, \dot{\mathbf{E}}_{i,s} \right) \\ &= 4\pi\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i^0) + \nabla \cdot \int_0^t ds \, \nabla \wedge \mathbf{B}_{i,s} - 4\pi\nabla \cdot \int_0^t ds \, \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_{i,s})\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_{i,s}). \end{aligned}$$

By the same argument as in (52) the second term is zero. We commute the divergence with the integration since $\mathbf{q}_{i,t}, \mathbf{p}_{i,t}$ are continuous functions of t and $\varrho_i \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R})$ and find

$$\begin{aligned} \ldots &= 4\pi\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i^0) - 4\pi \int_0^t ds \, \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_{i,s}) \cdot \nabla\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_{i,s}) \\ &= 4\pi\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_i^0) + 4\pi \int_0^t \frac{d}{ds}\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_{i,s}) \, ds = 4\pi\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_{i,t}) \end{aligned}$$

which concludes part (iii) and the proof. □

2.3 Proof of Regularity of ML solutions

Proof of Theorem 2.6. Assume the initial value $\varphi^0 \in D_w(A^{2m})$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. According to Theorem 2.5 we know that there exists a unique solution $t \mapsto \varphi_t = (\mathbf{q}_{i,t}, \mathbf{p}_{i,t}, \mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t})_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ which is in $C^{2m}(\mathbb{R}, D_w(A^{2m}))$ with $\varphi_t|_{t=0} = \varphi^0$. The first aim is to see whether the fields $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t}$ are smoother than a typical function in H_w^{curl}. We know that $(\nabla\wedge)^{2l}\mathbf{E}_{i,t}, (\nabla\wedge)^{2l}\mathbf{B}_{i,t} \in H_w^{curl}$ for any $0 \leq l \leq m$, but then

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla\wedge)^{2l}\mathbf{E}_{i,t} &= (\nabla\wedge)^{2l-2}(\nabla\wedge)^2\mathbf{E}_{i,t} = (\nabla\nabla \cdot - \triangle)^{l-1} (\nabla\wedge)^2\mathbf{E}_{i,t} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{l-1} \binom{l-1}{k} (\nabla\nabla\cdot)^k(-\triangle)^{l-1-k}(\nabla\wedge)^2\mathbf{E}_{i,t} = (-\triangle)^{l-1}(\nabla(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E}_{i,t}) - \triangle\mathbf{E}_{i,t}) \end{aligned}$$

in the distribution sense, where $\nabla\nabla\cdot$ denotes the gradient of the divergence. The same computation holds for $\mathbf{B}_{i,t}$. By inserting the constraints (25) we find:

$$(\nabla\wedge)^{2l}\mathbf{E}_{i,t} = 4\pi(-1)^{l-1}\triangle^{m-1}\nabla\varrho_i(\cdot - \mathbf{q}_{i,t}) + (-\triangle)^l\mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \qquad (\nabla\wedge)^{2l}\mathbf{B}_{i,t} = (-\triangle)^l\mathbf{B}_{i,t}.$$

As $\varrho_i \in C_c^\infty$ we may conclude that for any fixed $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $\triangle^l\mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \triangle^l\mathbf{B}_{i,t} \in L_w^2$ for $0 \le l \le m$ and therefore $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t} \in H_w^{\triangle^m}$ which proves claim (i). In particular, for every open $O \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^3$, $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t}$ are in $H_w^{\triangle^m}(O)$ which by Theorem 2.15 equals $H^{2m}(O)$. Lemma 2.11 then states $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t} \in H_{loc}^{2m}$. This provides the necessary conditions to apply Theorem 2.17(ii) which guarantees: In the equivalence class of $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}$ as well as $\mathbf{B}_{i,t}$ there is a representative in $C^l(\mathbb{R}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ for $0 \le l \le 2m - 2 = n - 2$. We denote these smooth representatives by the same symbols $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{i,t}$.

Moreover, for any $0 \le k \le n$ the mapping $t \mapsto \frac{d^k}{dt^k}\varphi_t$, and hence, the mappings $t \mapsto \frac{d^k}{dt^k}\mathbf{E}_{i,t}$ and $t \mapsto \frac{d^k}{dt^k}\mathbf{E}_{i,t}$ are continuous. Hence, for any open $\Lambda \subset\subset \mathbb{R}^4$ and for $k \le n$ the integrals

$$\int_\Lambda ds\; d^3x\; w(\mathbf{x}) \left\|\frac{d^k}{dt^k}\mathbf{E}_{i,s}\right\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}^2 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \int_\Lambda ds\; d^3x\; w(\mathbf{x}) \left\|\partial_{x_j}^k\mathbf{E}_{i,s}\right\|_{\mathbb{R}^3}^2 \;\text{ for } j = 1, 2, 3$$

are finite. Applying Sobolev's lemma in the form presented in [Rud73, Theorem 7.25] we yield that within the equivalence classes $\mathbf{E}_i$ as well as $\mathbf{B}_i$ there is a representative in $C^{n-2}(\mathbb{R}^4, \mathbb{R}^3)$ which proves claim (ii).

Assume $w \in \mathcal{W}^k$ for $k \ge 2$. Then Theorem 2.15 yields that also $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{B}_{i,t} \in H_w^{2m=n}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, and by Theorem 2.17(iii) there is a constant C such that (26) holds for every $1 \le i \le N$ which proves claim (iii) and concludes the proof. □

3 Constants of Motion

One is inclined to expect

$$H(t) := \sum_{i=1}^N \left[\sigma_i \sqrt{m_i^2 + \mathbf{p}_{i,t}^2} + \frac{1}{8\pi}\int d^3x\; \left(\mathbf{E}_{i,t}^2 + \mathbf{B}_{i,t}^2\right)\right] \tag{53}$$

as the preserved energy. For the case ML$_\varrho$ (16), i.e. $e_{ij} = 1$ for all $1 \le i, j \le N$, and initial values $\varphi^0 \in D_w(A)$ for weights $w \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $w(\mathbf{x}) = O_{\|\mathbf{x}\|\to\infty}(1)$ and $(\mathbf{q}_{i,t}, \mathbf{p}_{i,t}, \mathbf{E}_{i,t}, \mathbf{E}_{i,t})_{1\le i\le N} = M_L(t, t_0)[\varphi^0]$ this is indeed true. By computing the time derivative one can also see the mechanism of radiation damping as the particle and its own field exchange energy. This is so beautiful that it is a pity it is ill-defined in the point-particle limit. However, for weights $w \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $w(\mathbf{x}) \to 0$ for $\|\mathbf{x}\| \to \infty$ the integrals in the expression of $H(t)$ diverge and the total energy is infinite. Also in the case of ML-SI$_\varrho$ (17), i.e. $e_{ij} = 1 - \delta_{ij}$, the energy (53) is generically not conserved which can be understood as follows: In this case the time derivative of the electric field $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}$ in (14) depends on the position $\mathbf{q}_{i,t}$ and velocity $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{p}_{i,t})$ of the i-th charge which means that the charge can transfer energy by means of radiation to the field degrees of freedom. On the other hand the Lorentz force law acting on the i-th charge (15) does not depend on the i-th field since $e_{ii} = 0$. Therefore, the i-th charge cannot be in turn decelerated whenever it radiates. This way the charges can "pump" energy into their field degrees of freedom without "paying" by loss of kinetic energy. Hence, with respect to the ML-SI$_\varrho$ expression (53) is completely unnatural. Using a similar method introduced by [Roh94] in the context of the Lorentz-Dirac equations one can nevertheless define a variation of action principle to derive the ML-SI$_\varrho$ equations of motion (and also for the point-particle case ML-SI) from which all constants of motion can be inferred. These are, however, more implicit as (53) since they depend not only on data at one time instant t but on whole intervals of the solution. In the special case of (13) these constants of motion are discussed for point-particles in [WF49].

A An Abstract Global Existence Uniqueness Theorem

For this section let $\mathcal{B}$ be a Banach space with norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{B}}$. We consider two abstract operators A and J with the following properties:

Definition A.1 (Abstract Operator A)**.** *Let $A : D(A) \subseteq \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{B}$ be a linear operator with the properties:*

(i) A is closed and densely defined.

(ii) There exists a $\gamma \geq 0$ such that $(-\infty, -\gamma) \cup (\gamma, \infty) \subseteq \rho(A)$, the resolvent set of A.

(iii) The resolvent $R_\lambda(A) = \frac{1}{\lambda - A}$ of A with respect to $\lambda \in \rho(A)$ is bounded by $\frac{1}{|\lambda|-\gamma}$, i.e. for all $\phi \in \mathcal{B}, |\lambda| > \gamma$ we have $\|R_\lambda(A)\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq \frac{1}{|\lambda|-\gamma}\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}}$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $D(A^n) := \{\varphi \in D(A) \mid A^k\varphi \in D(A),\ 0 \leq k \leq n-1\}$.

Definition A.2 (Abstract Operator J)**.** *For an $n_J \in \mathbb{N}$ let $J : D(A) \to D(A^{n_J})$ be a mapping with the properties:*

(i) For all $0 \leq n \leq n_J$ there exist $C_{11}{}^{(n)}, C_{12}{}^{(n)} \in$ `Bounds` such that for all $\varphi, \widetilde{\varphi} \in D(A)$

$$\|A^n J(\varphi)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq C_{11}{}^{(n)}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}}), \qquad \|A^n(J(\varphi) - J(\widetilde{\varphi}))\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq C_{12}{}^{(n)}(\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{B}}, \|\widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{B}})\ \|\varphi - \widetilde{\varphi}\|_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

(ii) For all $0 \leq n \leq n_J$ and $T > 0$, $t \in (-T, T)$ and any $\varphi_{(\cdot)} \in C^n((-T,T), D(A^n))$ such that $\frac{d^k}{dt^k}\varphi_t \in D(A^{n-k})$ for $k \leq n$, the operator J fulfills for $j + l \leq n-1$:

  (a) $\frac{d^j}{dt^j}A^l J(\varphi_t) \in D(A^{n-1-j-l})$ and

  (b) $t \mapsto \frac{d^j}{dt^j}A^l J(\varphi_t)$ is continuous on $(-T, T)$.

For those operators one can show:

Theorem A.3 (Abstract Global Existence and Uniqueness)**.** *Let A and J be the operators introduced in Definitions (A.1) and (A.2) then:*

(i) (local existence) For each $\varphi^0 \in D(A^n)$ with $n \leq n_J$, there exists a $T > 0$ and a mapping $\varphi_{(\cdot)} \in C^n((-T,T), D(A^n))$ which solves the equation

$$\dot{\varphi}_t = A\varphi_t + J(\varphi_t) \tag{54}$$

for initial value $\varphi_t|_{t=0} = \varphi^0$. Furthermore, $\frac{d^k}{dt^k}\varphi_t \in D(A^{n-k})$ for $k \leq n$ and $t \in (-T, T)$.

(ii) *(uniqueness) If* $\widetilde{\varphi}_{(\cdot)} \in C^1((-\widetilde{T}, \widetilde{T}), D(A))$ *for some* $\widetilde{T} > 0$ *is also a solution to (54) and* $\widetilde{\varphi}_t|_{t=0} = \varphi_t|_{t=0}$*, then* $\varphi_t = \widetilde{\varphi}_t$ *for all* $t \in (-T, T) \cap (-\widetilde{T}, \widetilde{T})$*.*

(iii) *(global existence) Assume in addition that for any solution* $\varphi_{(\cdot)}$ *of equation (54) with* $\varphi_t|_{t=0} \in D(A^n)$ *and* $T < \infty$ *there exists a* $C_{19} = C_{19}(T) < \infty$ *such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [-T,T]} \|\varphi_t\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq C_{19}(T) \tag{55}$$

then (i) and (ii) holds for any $T \in \mathbb{R}$*.*

REMARK A.4. *Definition A.2(ii) is only needed if one aims at two or more times differentiable solutions.*

The proof of Theorem A.3 is a generalization of the main proof in [BD01] where a skew-adjoint operator A was assumed. However, for our purpose the skew-adjointness must be loosened and, here, is replaced by the conditions on A given in Definition A.1. These conditions are required to apply the Hille-Yosida theorem [HP74] to assure:

Lemma A.5 (Abstract Contraction Group)**.** *Operator* A *introduced in Definition A.1 generates a* γ*-contractive group* $(W_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ *on* $\mathcal{B}$*, i.e. a family of linear operators* $(W_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ *on* $\mathcal{B}$ *with the properties that for all* $\varphi \in D(A)$*,*$\phi \in \mathcal{B}$ *and* $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$*:*

(i) $\lim_{t \to 0} W_t\, \phi = \phi$*,*

(ii) $W_{t+s}\phi = W_t W_s \phi$*,*

(iii) $W_t\varphi \in D(A)$*,*

(iv) $AW_t\varphi = W_t A\varphi$*,*

(v) $W_{(\cdot)}\varphi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, D(A))$*,*

(vi) $\frac{d}{dt} W_t\varphi = AW_t\varphi$*,*

(vii) $\|W_t\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq e^{\gamma|t|}\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{B}}$*.*

With the help of $(W_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ one can then show the existence and uniqueness of local solutions to the integral equation

$$\varphi_t = W_t\varphi^0 + \int_0^t W_{t-s} J(\varphi_s)\, ds$$

via Banach's fixed point theorem which can be applied because of the convenient regularity condition imposed on operator J. One can show further that all these solutions are regular enough to solve the equation (54). Global existence is then achieved with the help of the a priori bound (55). See also [Paz92] for a beautiful exposition on the topic of time-evolution equations.

Proof of Theorem A.3. [Proof of Theorem A.3] (i) Since we want to apply Banach's fixed point theorem, we define a Banach space on which we later define our self-mapping. For $T > 0$ let

$$X_{T,n} := \Big\{ \varphi_{(\cdot)} : [-T, T] \to D(A^n) \,\Big|\, t \mapsto A^j\varphi_t \in C^0([-T,T], D(A^n)) \text{ for } j \leq n \\ \text{and } \|\varphi\|_{X_{T,n}} := \sup_{T \in [-T,T]} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \|A^j\varphi_t\|_{\mathcal{B}} < \infty \Big\}.$$

$(X_{T,n}, \|\cdot\|_{X_{T,n}})$ is a Banach space because it is normed and linear by definition, and complete because A on $D(A)$ is closed. Note that the mapping $t \mapsto W_t\varphi^0$ is an element of $X_{T,n}$ because for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$

and $j \leq n$ we have $t \to A^j W_t \varphi^0 = W_t A^j \varphi^0$ which is continuous and $\|W_t A^j \varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq e^{\gamma|t|}\|A^j \varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ by Lemma A.5 and because $\varphi^0 \in D(A^n)$. Let

$$M_{T,n,\varphi^0} := \left\{ \varphi_{(\cdot)} \in X_{T,n} \;\middle|\; \varphi_t|_{t=0} = \varphi^0, \|\varphi_{(\cdot)} - W_{(\cdot)}\varphi^0\|_{X_{T,n}} \leq 1 \right\},$$

which is a closed subset of $X_{T,n}$. Next we show that

$$S_{\varphi^0} : M_{T,n,\varphi^0} \to M_{T,n,\varphi^0} \qquad \varphi_{(\cdot)} \mapsto S_{\varphi^0}[\varphi_{(\cdot)}] := W_t \varphi^0 + \int_0^t W_{t-s} J(\varphi_s)\, ds \tag{56}$$

is a well-defined, contracting self-mapping provided T is chosen sufficiently small. The following estimates are based on the fact that for all $\varphi_{(\cdot)} \in M_{T,n,\varphi^0}$ we have the estimate $\|\varphi_t\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq 1 + \|W_t \varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq 1 + e^{\gamma|t|}\|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq 1 + e^{\gamma T}\|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ for each $t \in [-T, T]$. Let also $\widetilde{\varphi}_{(\cdot)} \in M_{T,n,\varphi^0}$, then the properties of J, see Definition A.2, yield the helpful estimates for all $t \in [-T, T]$:

$$\|A^j J(\varphi_t)\| \leq C_{20}(T) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|A^j (J(\varphi_t) - J(\widetilde{\varphi}_t))\| \leq C_{21}(T)\|\varphi_t - \widetilde{\varphi}_t\|_{\mathcal{B}}. \tag{57}$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} C_{20}(T) &:= C_{11}{}^{(j)}(\|\varphi_t\|_{\mathcal{B}}) \leq C_{11}{}^{(j)}(1 + e^{\gamma|t|}\|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{B}}) \text{ and} \\ C_{21}(T) &:= C_{12}{}^{(j)}(1 + e^{\gamma|t|}\|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{B}}, 1 + e^{\gamma|t|}\|\varphi^0\|_{\mathcal{B}}). \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

Hence, $C_{20}(T), C_{21}(T)$ depend continuously and non-decreasingly on T.

We show now that S_{φ^0} is a self-mapping. Since $t \mapsto W_t \varphi^0$ is in M_{T,n,φ^0}, it suffices to show that the mapping $t \mapsto A^j \int_0^t W_{t-s} J(\varphi_s)\, ds$ is $D(A^{n-j})$ valued, continuous and that its $\|\cdot\|_{X_{T,n}}$ norm is finite for $j \leq n$. Consider $\varphi_{(\cdot)} \in M_{T,n,\varphi^0}$, so for some $h > 0$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|A^j W_{t-(s+h)} J(\varphi_{s+h}) - A^j W_{t-s} J(\varphi_s)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \\ &\leq e^{\gamma|t-(s+h)|}\|A^j (J(\varphi_{s+h}) - J(\varphi_s))\|_{\mathcal{B}} + e^{\gamma|t-s|}\|(1 - W_h) A^j J(\varphi_s)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \\ &\leq e^{\gamma|t-(s+h)|} C_{21}\|\varphi_{s+h} - \varphi_s\|_{\mathcal{B}} + e^{\gamma|t-s|}\|(1 - W_h) A^j J(\varphi_s)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \xrightarrow[h \to 0]{} 0 \end{aligned}$$

by continuity of $t \to \varphi_t$, estimate (57) and properties of $(W_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$. We may thus define

$$\sigma^{(j)}(t) := \int_0^t A^j W_{t-s} J(\varphi_s)\, ds$$

as $\mathcal{B}$ valued Riemann integrals. Let $\sigma_N^{(j)}(t) := \frac{t}{N}\sum_{k=1}^N A^j W_{t-\frac{t}{N}k} J(\varphi_{\frac{t}{N}k})$ be the corresponding Riemann sums. Clearly $\sigma_N^j(t) \in D(A^{n-j})$ since $J : D(A) \to D(A_J^n)$ and $\lim_{N \to \infty} A^j \sigma_N(t) = \sigma^{(j)}(t)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $j \leq n$. But A is closed which implies $\sigma^0(t) \in D(A^n)$ and $\sigma^j(t) = A^j \sigma^0(t)$. Next we show continuity. With estimate (57) we get for $t \in (-T, T)$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|A^j \sigma(t+h) - A^j \sigma(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \|\sigma^j(t+h) - \sigma^j(t)\|_{\mathcal{B}} \\ &\leq \int_t^{t+h} \left\| W_{t+h-s} A^j J(\varphi_s) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}} ds + \int_0^t \left\| W_{t-s}(W_h - 1) A^j J(\varphi_s) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}} ds \\ &\leq e^{\gamma|h|} \int_t^{t+h} \left\| A^j J(\varphi_s) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}} + e^{\gamma T} \int_0^t \left\| (W_h - 1) A^j J(\varphi_s) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}} ds \end{aligned}$$

For $h \to 0$ the right-hand side goes to zero as the integrand of the second summand $\|(W_h - 1)A^j J(\varphi_s)\|_{\mathcal{B}}$ does, which by (57) is also bounded by $(1+e^{\gamma T})C_{20}(T)$ so that dominated convergence can be used. The self-mapping property is ensured by (57):

$$\|S_{\varphi^0}[\varphi_{(\cdot)}] - W_{(\cdot)}\varphi^0\|_{X_{T,n}} = \sup_{t\in[-T,T]} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \left\| A^j \int_0^t W_{t-s} J(\varphi_s)\, ds \right\|_{\mathcal{B}}$$

$$\leq e^{\gamma T} \sup_{t\in[-T,T]} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \int_0^t \|A^j J(\varphi_s)\|_{\mathcal{B}}\, ds \leq T e^{\gamma T} C_{20}(T)(n+1).$$

On the other hand for some $\widetilde{\varphi}_{(\cdot)} \in M_{T,n,\varphi^0}$ we find

$$\|S_{\varphi^0}[\varphi_{(\cdot)}] - S_{\varphi^0}[\widetilde{\varphi}_{(\cdot)}]\|_{X_{T,n}} = \sup_{t\in[-T,T]} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \|A^j \int_0^t W_{t-s}[J(\varphi_s) - J(\widetilde{\varphi}_s)]\, ds\|_{\mathcal{B}}$$

$$\leq e^{\gamma T} \sup_{t\in[-T,T]} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \int_0^t \|A^j[J(\varphi_s) - J(\widetilde{\varphi}_s)]\|_{\mathcal{B}}\, ds \leq T e^{\gamma T} C_{21}(T) \|\varphi_{(\cdot)} - \widetilde{\varphi}_{(\cdot)}\|_{X_{T,n}}.$$

Since $T \mapsto C_{20}(T)$ and $T \mapsto C_{21}(T)$ are continuous and non-decreasing, there exists a $T > 0$ such that

$$T e^{\gamma T}[C_{20}(T)(n+1) + C_{21}(T)] < 1. \tag{59}$$

Thus, for this choice of T, S_{φ^0} is a contracting self-mapping on the closed set M_{T,n,φ^0} so that due to Banach's fixed point theorem S_{φ^0} has a unique fixed point $\varphi_{(\cdot)} \in M_{T,\varphi^0}$.

Next we study the differentiability of this fixed point, in particular of $t \to A^j\varphi_t$ on $(-T,T)$ for $j \leq (n-1)$. As $\varphi_{(\cdot)} = S_{\varphi^0}[\varphi_{(\cdot)}]$, Definition (56), and $\varphi^0 \in D(A^n)$ we have

$$\frac{A^j\varphi_{t+h} - A^j\varphi_t}{h} = \frac{W_{t+h} - W_t}{h} A^j\varphi^0 + \frac{\sigma^j(t+h) - \sigma^j(t)}{h} =: \boxed{11} + \boxed{12}.$$

By the properties of $(W_t)_{t\in\mathbb{R}}$ we know $\lim_{h\to 0} \boxed{11} = A^{j+1}\varphi^0$. Furthermore,

$$\boxed{12} = \frac{1}{h}\int_t^{t+h} W_{t+h-s} A^j J(\varphi_s)\, ds + \int_0^t W_{t-s} \frac{W_h - 1}{h} A^j J(\varphi_s)\, ds$$

For $h \to 0$ the first term on the right-hand side converges to $A^j J(\varphi_t)$ because of

$$\frac{1}{h}\left\| \int_t^{t+h} W_{t+h-s} A^j J(\varphi_s)\, ds - A^j J(\varphi_t) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \sup_{s\in(t,t+h)} \left\| W_{t+h-s} A^j J(\varphi_s) - A^j J(\varphi_t) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}}$$

and the continuity of $W_{t+h-s}A^j J(\varphi_s)$ in h and s. For $h \to 0$ the second term converges to $\int_0^t W_{t-s} A^{j+1} J(\varphi_s)\, ds$ by dominated convergence as the integrand converges to $W_{t-s}A^{j+1}J(\varphi_s)$, and the following gives a convenient bound of it:

$$\left\| W_{t-s} \frac{W_h - 1}{h} A^j J(\varphi_s) \right\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \left\| \frac{1}{h} \int_0^h W_{t-s} W_{h'} A^{j+1} J(\varphi_s)\, dh' \right\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq e^{\gamma(T+1)} \|A^{j+1} J(\varphi_s)\|_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Collecting all terms, we have shown that

$$\frac{d}{dt}A^j\varphi_t = A^j W_t\varphi^0 + A^j J(\varphi_t) + A^{j+1}\int_0^t W_{t-s}J(\varphi_s)\,ds = A^{j+1}\varphi_t + A^j J(\varphi_t).$$

Note that the right-hand side is continuous because $j \leq (n-1)$, $\varphi_{(\cdot)} \in M_{T,n,\varphi^0}$ and (57). Hence $A^j\varphi_{(\cdot)} \in C^1((-T,T), D(A^{n-j}))$ and $\frac{d}{dt}A^j\varphi_t \in D(A^{n-j-1})$ for all $t \in (-T,T)$. Next we prove for $t \in (-T,T)$ and $k \leq n$ that $\varphi_{(\cdot)} \in C^n((-T,T), D(A^n))$, $\frac{d^k}{dt^k}\varphi_t \in D(A^{n-k})$ by induction. We claim that

$$\frac{d^k}{dt^k}\varphi_t = A^k\varphi_t + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\frac{d^{k-1-l}}{dt^{k-1-l}}A^l J(\varphi_t)$$

holds, is continuous in t on $(-T,T)$ and in $D(A^{n-k})$. We have shown before that this holds for $k = 0$. Assume it is true for some $(k-1) \leq n-1$. We compute

$$\frac{d}{dt}\frac{d^{k-1}}{dt^{k-1}}\varphi_t = A^k\varphi_t + A^{k-1}J(\varphi_t) + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2}\frac{d^{k-1-l}}{dt^{k-1-l}}A^l J(\varphi_t) = A^k\varphi_t + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1}\frac{d^{k-1-l}}{dt^{k-1-l}}A^l J(\varphi_t).$$

The first term on the right-hand side is continuous in t on $(-T,T)$ and in $D(A^{n-k})$ as shown before. Now Definition (A.2)(ii), where we have defined the operator J, was chosen to guarantee that these properties hold also for the second term.

(ii) Clearly, $\varphi_{(\cdot)}$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}_{(\cdot)}$ are both in $X_{T_1,1}$ for any $0 < T_1 \leq \min(T,\widetilde{T})$ because they are at least once continuously differentiable. Since $\varphi_t|_{t=0} = \widetilde{\varphi}_t|_{t=0}$ holds, we can choose $T_1 > 0$ sufficiently small such that $\varphi_{(\cdot)}$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}_{(\cdot)}$ are also in $M_{T_1,1,\varphi^0}$ and in addition that S_{φ^0} is a contracting self-mapping on $M_{T_1,1,\varphi^0}$. As in (i) we infer that there exists a unique fixed point $\varphi^1_{(\cdot)} \in M_{T_1,1,\varphi^0}$ of S_{φ^0} which solves (54). Since $\varphi_{(\cdot)}$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}_{(\cdot)}$ also solve (54), it must hold that $\varphi_t = \varphi^1_t = \widetilde{\varphi}_t$ on $[-T_1,T_1]$. Let $\overline{T}$ be the supremum of all those T_1 and let us assume that $\overline{T} < \min(T,\widetilde{T})$. We can repeat the above argument with e.g. initial values $\varphi_t|_{t=T_1} = \widetilde{\varphi}_t|_{t=T_1}$ at time $t = T_1$. Again we find a $T_2 > 0$ and a fixed point $\varphi^2_{(\cdot)} \in M_{T_2,1,\varphi_{\overline{T}}}$ of $S_{\varphi_{\overline{T}}}$ so that $\varphi_t = \varphi^2_{t-\overline{T}} = \widetilde{\varphi}_t$ on $[\overline{T}-T_2, \overline{T}-T_2]$. The same can be done for initial values $\varphi_t|_{t=-T_1} = \widetilde{\varphi}_t|_{t=-T_1}$ at time $t = -T_1$. This yields $\varphi_t = \widetilde{\varphi}_t$ for $t \in [\overline{T}-T_2, \overline{T}+T_2]$ and contradicts the maximality of $\overline{T}$. Hence, $\varphi_{(\cdot)}$ equals $\widetilde{\varphi}_{(\cdot)}$ on $[-T,T] \cap [-\widetilde{T},\widetilde{T}]$.

(iii) Fix any $\widetilde{T} > 0$. The a priori bound (55) tells us that if any solution $\varphi : (-\widetilde{T},\widetilde{T}) \to D(A^n)$ with $\varphi_t|_{t=0} = \varphi^0 \in D(A^n)$ exists, then $\sup_{t\in[-\widetilde{T},\widetilde{T}]}\|\varphi_t\|_{\mathcal{B}} \leq C_{19}(\widetilde{T}) < \infty$. By looking at equations (59) and (58) we infer that there exists a $T_{min} > 0$ such that for each $t \in [-\widetilde{T},\widetilde{T}]$ the time span T for which S_{φ_t} on M_{T,n,φ_t} fulfills $T_{min} \leq T$. Let $\varphi_{(\cdot)}$ be the fixed point of S_{φ^0} on M_{T_1,n,φ^0} for $T_1 > 0$, and let $\overline{T}$ be the supremum of such T_1. Assume $\overline{T} < \widetilde{T}$. By taking an initial value $\varphi_{\pm(\overline{T}-\epsilon)}$ for $0 < \epsilon < T_{min}$ near to the boundary, (i) and (ii) extends the solution beyond $(-\overline{T},\overline{T})$ and contradicts the maximality of $\overline{T}$. $\square$

References

[AK01] W. Appel and Michael K.-H. Kiessling. Mass and spin renormalization in Lorentz electrodynamics. *Annals of Physics*, 289(1):24–83, 2001.

[Bar80] A. O. Barut. *Electrodynamics and Classical Theory of Fields and Particles*. Dover Publications, September 1980.

[BD01] G. Bauer and D. Dürr. The Maxwell-Lorentz system of a rigid charge. *Annales Henri Poincare*, 2(1):179–196, April 2001.

[BDD10] G. Bauer, D.-A. Deckert, and D. Dürr. On the Existence of Dynamics of Wheeler-Feynman Electrodynamics. *arXiv:1009.3103v2*, 2010.

[Dec10] D.-A. Deckert. *Electrodynamic Absorber Theory - A Mathematical Study*. Der Andere Verlag, ISBN 978-3-86247-004-4, January 2010.

[Dir38] P. A. M. Dirac. Classical theory of radiating electrons. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 167(929):148–169, August 1938.

[Fre25] J. Frenkel. Zur Elektrodynamik punktförmiger Elektronen. *Zeitschrift für Physik A Hadrons and Nuclei*, 32(1):518–534, December 1925.

[H0̈5] L. Hörmander. *The analysis of linear partial differential operators. II*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005. Differential operators with constant coefficients, Reprint of the 1983 original.

[HP74] E. Hille and R. S Phillips. *Functional analysis and semi-groups*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R. I., 1974. Third printing of the revised edition of 1957, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, Vol. XXXI.

[IKS02] V. Imaikin, A. Komech, and H. Spohn. Soliton-type asymptotics and scattering for a charge coupled to the maxwell field. *Russian Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 9(4):428–436, 2002.

[Kie04] M. K.-H. Kiessling. Electromagnetic Field Theory Without Divergence Problems 1. The Born Legacy. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 116(1):1057–1122, 2004.

[KS00] A. Komech and H. Spohn. Long-time asymptotics for the coupled maxwell-lorentz equations. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 25(3):559, 2000.

[Lie01] E. H. Lieb. *Analysis*. Oxford University Press, 2nd edition, May 2001.

[Nod64] J. Nodvik. A covariant formulation of classical electrodynamics for charges of finite extension. *Annals of Physics*, 28(2):225–319, 1964.

[Paz92] Amnon Pazy. *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*. Springer, February 1992.

[Roh94] F. Rohrlich. *Classical Charged Particles*. Westview Press, December 1994.

[Rud73] W. Rudin. *Functional Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, 1st edition, 1973.

[Sch63] A. Schild. Electromagnetic Two-Body problem. *Physical Review*, 131(6):2762, 1963.

[SMSM71] Carl L. Siegel, Jürgen K. Moser, C.L. Siegel, and J.K. Moser. *Lectures on Celestial Mechanics*. Springer, January 1971.

[Spo04] Herbert Spohn. *Dynamics of Charged Particles and their Radiation Field*. Cambridge University Press, October 2004.

[SR75] B. Simon and M. Reed. *II Fourier Analysis, Self-Adjointness*. Academic Press Inc, November 1975.

[WF45] J. A. Wheeler and R. P. Feynman. Interaction with the absorber as the mechanism of radiation. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 17(2-3):157, April 1945.

[WF49] J. A. Wheeler and R. P. Feynman. Classical electrodynamics in terms of direct interparticle action. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 21(3):425, July 1949.

G. Bauer
FH Münster
Bismarckstraße 11, 48565 Steinfurt, Germany

D.-A. Deckert
Department of Mathematics, University of California Davis
One Shields Avenue, Davis, California 95616, USA

D. Dürr
Mathematisches Institut der LMU München
Theresienstraße 39, 80333 München, Germany